





LIBRARY
OF THE
UNIVERSITY
OF ILLINOIS



*Prospects of Peace for the Church in the
Prayer Book and its Rules*

A C H A R G E

DELIVERED TO THE

CLERGY OF THE ARCHDEACONRY
OF MAIDSTONE

At the Ordinary Visitation

IN APRIL, MDCCCLXXV

WITH AN APPENDIX ON THE DOUBTFUL RUBRICS

BY

BENJAMIN HARRISON, M.A.

ARCHDEACON OF MAIDSTONE

London

RIVINGTONS, WATERLOO PLACE

HIGH STREET

Oxford

TRINITY STREET

Cambridge

CANTERBURY; A. GINDER, ST. GEORGE'S HALL; HAL DRURY, MERCERY LANE;
MAIDSTONE, WICKHAM AND SON

1875

TO THE REVEREND THE
RURAL DEANS AND CLERGY
OF THE
ARCHDEACONRY OF MAIDSTONE;
AND TO
THE CHURCHWARDENS AND SIDESMEN
This Charge,
PUBLISHED IN CONFORMITY WITH THEIR UNITED REQUESTS,
IS
Inscribed,
WITH FEELINGS OF BROTHERLY ATTACHMENT,
AND SINCERE RESPECT AND REGARD.

PRECINCTS, CANTERBURY,
MAY IV, MDCCCLXXV

A CHARGE

MY REVEREND BRETHREN,

It is with great satisfaction that I meet you again, assembled in your several deaneries for the accustomed duties of the Visitation; and under circumstances less full of anxiety and disquiet, I think we may justly feel, than when we met last year. There is, at the same time, enough in the present position of things, and in the prospect before us of the next few months, to give rise to serious thought; and I shall be turning to the best account, if I mistake not, the opportunity which the Visitation offers me, in fulfilment of the duties of my office among you, if I invite your attention to matters which have doubtless at this moment a prominent place in the minds of all, both of ourselves the Clergy, and of our brethren of the Laity; and which, within the narrow limits, which I do

not wish to exceed, of the customary Address on these occasions, I desire to touch upon, in no other interests than those of truth and peace, in the spirit of Christian charity and brotherly love.

But first, in regard to a primary object of the Archdeacon's office, and one which the duties of the Visitation have special regard to—I mean, the care of the sacred fabrics devoted to the worship and service of God—I would briefly refer to what has been done in the course of the past year, or is now in hand, in the work of restoration and improvement within the Archdeaconry. Of churches consecrated by the Archbishop last summer, I may mention Christ Church, Erith, erected with great individual liberality¹ to supply a large amount of church accommodation, the whole free, in a populous and increasing parish; the church of Leysdown, in the Isle of Sheppy, entirely rebuilt upon the old site, in the place of a miserable fragment of the original church, fitted up in the most wretched manner; and the parish church of Murston, rebuilt on a central site, in the midst of the population which had been brought together by the opening of brickfields; the new structure having carefully wrought into it the ancient columns and arches, and whatever else was of interest, and worth preserving, of the old church. Later in the

¹ I cannot refrain from expressly acknowledging the earnest zeal and bounty shown by the founder, the Rev. Robert Wood, and by the Goschen family; as also by the donor of the site, Colonel Wheatley.

year the Archbishop officiated and preached at the reopening of the church of Sidcup, where a modern building, of somewhat peculiar character, has been enlarged and improved by throwing certain side corridors into the body of the church, and reseating it within. I would mention with special satisfaction—I may rather say, admiration—the skill and success with which the church of Sutton Valence, erected some fifty years ago, in the worst days of church building, on the ruins of the old church, which had been condemned—somewhat summarily it would seem—as hopelessly dilapidated, and to be pulled down, has been converted, by the insertion of a pointed arcade, and other alterations, from a cold and bare parallelogram into a fabric bearing the character of a house of God, fitted for the purposes of worship and the celebration of holy rites.

I must now briefly enumerate works of substantial repair, restoration, and internal rearrangement,—in some cases finished, in others still in hand, or about to be undertaken, or resumed or carried on to full completion,—at Little Chart, Great Chart, Hollingbourne, West Farleigh, Sandhurst, and Tudely; the restoration of the chancel at Iwade; enlargement of the church at Paddock Wood; an important addition and essential improvement in Ashford Church; alteration which would give much better accommodation for worship in Trinity Church, Maidstone; internal rearrangement at Cranbrook; and like designs in other places more or

less matured; as, for instance, at Rodmersham, and Upchurch, and, in the case of Addington church, Surrey, by the addition of a north aisle. The new church of St. Paul, Sheerness, already requires and will speedily receive, I anticipate, the like addition, to complete the original design. I might mention also improvements made, repairs effected, or adornments added in the way of windows, or other internal decoration, in the churches of Berstead, Bickley, Christ Church, and St. Saviour's, Croydon, and Shoreham. With renewed acknowledgment of the great munificence shewn by an individual parishioner,¹ I would report that the great enlargement in hand of the church of Boughton Monchelsea,—in fact its almost rebuilding,—is now nearly approaching completion; while at the same time steps are taking for the better supply of the spiritual wants of the outlying portion of the parish.

In connexion with this, I desire to speak of the attention which is now being given, in an especial manner, to the necessities of scattered populations, in hamlets remote from the parish church, or where new lines of railway communication have created fresh settlements—a demand scarcely less important, or less pressing, than that of the overgrown population of our great towns and cities. I may refer to the erection, now in hand, of a church at Matfield Green, in the widely extended parish of

¹ William Moore, Esq., of Wierton.

Brenchley; and I would report with special satisfaction that there is a prospect now, I hope, of securing the building of a church, and the formation of a consolidated chapelry, at Four Elms, in the parish of Hever, to provide for the outlying portions of that parish, Brasted, Chiddingstone, and perhaps Edenbridge. Still more heartily do I rejoice to think, in regard to that other great duty incumbent upon us of supplying the growing wants of our principal towns, that, the complicated difficulties which beset the case having been happily overcome, as I was able to report last year, preliminary arrangements now satisfactorily adjusted, and amended plans prepared, there is good hope at length of seeing speedily rising, in the West Borough of Maidstone, a new church for the parish of St. Peter's, more adequate to supply the spiritual wants of that populous district than the small fabric which, some five-and-thirty years ago, was recovered from desecration and consecrated anew, the old Pilgrims' Chapel. Together with the free gift of a site—two sites, indeed, were offered, one by the late lamented Earl of Romney—large donations have been made by individuals, bountiful, I may truly say, after the manner of Maidstone Churchmen, towards the building; gifts which, I trust, will be aided by grants as liberal as their funds will allow, from the Diocesan and the Incorporated Church Building Societies; and that these will be supplemented by general contributions

sufficient to complete the amount required, to give to the town of Maidstone, on the western side of the Medway, an essential ornament, and a great blessing to a growing neighbourhood; conducing to the strength and increase of the Church amongst us, and to the glory of Almighty God. With regard to another important place in the Archdeaconry, Tunbridge, I feel constrained to say that, although the erection, some years ago, of St. Stephen's Church, at the southern extremity of the town, supplied the religious wants of the population which had sprung up in the neighbourhood of the railway station, there is now an urgent—indeed, I may say, a crying—need for an adequate supply of regular pastoral visiting, church accommodation, and all the spiritual ministries of the Church, to the numerous families that have been drawn to Tunbridge by its excellent and flourishing school, and that will probably be settling there in increasing numbers. It is a claim which has long been felt, and will, I trust, now speedily be satisfied, by the complete rearrangement of the parish church, a work which ought not to be longer delayed; and, at all events, by the erection, in the northern part of the parish, of a new church or chapel, under such conditions as, on full consideration now in hand of all the circumstances of the case, may be found to be most expedient, in justice to those immediately concerned, and with due regard to the permanent welfare and best interests of the parish.

With works in hand like these—and I have specified only those, it will be borne in mind, which have been going on during the past year, or are at the present moment in progress—it is superfluous for me to urge, how important it is, in the first place, to strengthen the hands and replenish continually the resources of the Society which Archbishop Longley bequeathed, I may say, as a sacred legacy to the diocese; established as it was by his own great personal exertions and influence, with the large experience derived from the like efforts in the populous dioceses which he had administered in succession, of Ripon, Durham, and York. I trust that the endeavour, by the agency of a travelling Lay Secretary, lately appointed, to enlist in the Society's behalf a body of small subscribers in our chief towns, will produce satisfactory results; and that the Clergy will not fail, in their several parishes, in compliance with the Archbishop's Pastoral Letter, given yearly to this and the sister Society, the Diocesan Board of Education, in turn, to make their appeal in a cause for the successful carrying on of which—for the sake of Christ and His Church, "for His sheep that are scattered abroad," or lacking a shepherd's care "in the midst of this naughty world,"¹ and for the lambs of His flock, whom He so earnestly commended to the tender love of His true-hearted Apostle—our active efforts, united, steady, and per-

¹ Exhortation in the Ordination Service.

severing, if we truly love our Divine Lord and Master, ought by all the members of His Church to be made, in their respective positions, and according to their individual ability. I earnestly hope that, in future Reports of either of the two Diocesan Societies, having these objects in view, there may be no single parish against the name of which, in the lists of the several Local Boards, no return is made. I am well aware, my Reverend Brethren, that in many cases the collection is mainly indebted to the contribution of the clergyman: and our right-minded laity would not less clearly see, and fully acknowledge, that, however willingly the Clergy may recognise it as their duty and privilege to assist, according to their means, in such good works, the Societies ought essentially to be regarded as the channel through which the *Lay* members of the Church may cast into the treasury of God, or present on His holy Table, their gifts for the service of His temple, for supplying to their poorer brethren the means of grace, and fulfilling that which "the Lord" hath "ordained, that they which preach the Gospel should live of the Gospel."¹ The incumbent of a small parish need not, therefore, I think, feel ashamed to send though it were but a few shillings, as the proceeds of the appeal made to his parishioners, in obedience to the Pastoral Letter. Such appeals, in like manner as has been experienced in the case of those which

¹ 1 Cor. ix. 14.

are made for foreign missions, for our countrymen scattered in other lands far from the means of grace, and for the heathen in their darkness, may be found to react profitably on those who are led thereby more fully to estimate their own blessings; and above all, the offerings, humble though they be, we know will be graciously accepted of Him who once, as He "sat over against the treasury," saw and commended the gift which the poor widow cast in, of her poverty, "into the offerings of God."¹ And in regard to those of our lay brethren who are blest with this world's abundance, it is to be hoped that the organisation of the Diocesan Societies, extending, as it does, into every part of the diocese, and combining the laity with the clergy, may be so turned to account as to bring before those who come into the county, and occupy some of its fairest heritages, its "pleasant places," claims upon their Christian bounty which, I am persuaded, in many cases, need only to be made known to them to obtain a willing and liberal response.²

And this leads me on, my Reverend Brethren, to the wider and larger view of the paramount importance, at the present time, of that mutual confidence, that cordial co-operation, that brotherly unity, without which it is impossible that the Church amongst us, "the body of Christ," should accomplish the work, or attain the ends for which

¹ St. Mark xii. 41-44; St. Luke xxi. 1-4.

² See Note (A).

it was ordained by Him who is its Divine Founder and Head. I alluded, in my opening words, to the circumstances of our meeting in Visitation at this time last year. I may freely express to you that I felt some degree of embarrassment, in preparing words with which I might fitly and seasonably address you then, inasmuch as the day on which I entered on my Visitation was the very day¹ on which, according to notice duly given, our Most Reverend Diocesan was to call the attention of the House of Lords to the present state of the laws regulating Divine Service in the Church. Whether any, and, if any, what precise measure was to be grounded on that notice, I had not thought it proper to inquire, and therefore was altogether in the dark. But this I felt was clear—that, in the temporary lull, as it seemed, of external attacks, under the then circumstances of the political world, it was our duty, and would be our wisdom, to devote our special attention to dangers which seemed more threatening than those which beset us from without. With this view I was desirous of considering with you—for on these occasions, as I have expressed to you before now, it is the opening of subjects like these, not the pronouncing any final conclusion or individual judgment upon them, which befits the address of him whose duty it is to preside in this our solemn gathering for the accustomed Visitation,—the “measures and

¹ April 20, 1874.

means of unity in the Church at the present time." There seemed to me grounds of union, and tokens of brotherly co-operation, which it was highly important to recognise and improve; scope for the free action, without mutual suspicion, of "Evangelical Truth" and "Apostolical Order"—to adopt terms which have often been used, in no party sense—within the due limits of the Church of England; within the landmarks which our fathers had set, at the time when, by God's mercy and under His overruling providence, they reformed that branch of the Church Catholic which had been planted from early times in this island; restoring it from the corruptions, and emancipating it from the usurpations of Rome, with careful reference, at every step, to primitive practice as witnessed in Holy Scripture, and embodied in the Creeds and Liturgies, the framework and order of the Church Apostolic, "according to the pattern shown in the mount" Sion.¹ Within the limits of the Church of England, as defined in her formularies and exemplified by her wisest and most faithful sons, standing "fast in the liberty wherewith Christ" had made them "free,"² there seemed "ample room and verge enough the characters of" *Heaven* "to trace;" one phase of Divine truth, perhaps, appearing most conspicuous at one period of her history and a different one at another; but all alike component elements, how-

¹ Heb. viii. 5; xii. 22.

² Gal. v. 1.

ever the prism of the finite human mind might sever or distinguish them, of the One pure, perfect light of heaven, the Sun of the spiritual system, casting His "bright beams of light upon" His Church,¹ in manifold hues, in the midst of the darkest, most threatening sky, the sure pledge of steadfast hope, "the bow in the cloud in the day of rain."²

But, on the other hand, it was clear that there were *limits* to this freedom of individual minds, this comprehensiveness of the Church's system; lines of truth and order fixed, beyond which liberty becomes license, with all the attendant evils of division, mutual suspicion, heart-burnings, and alarm. And with these mischiefs would come the danger of provoking legislation in a hostile spirit, narrowing, too probably, the liberty which the faithful and soberminded of the Church's sons, clergy and laity, had highly prized, and would never desire to abuse. Amidst these perils, it seemed to be more than ever necessary to have recourse, in the spirit of dutiful loyalty, to the Church's rule, laid down in the Preface to the Book of Common Prayer, that, "forasmuch as nothing can be so plainly set forth, but doubts may arise in the use and practice of the same; to appease all such diversity (if any arise) and for the resolution of all doubts, concerning the manner how to understand,

¹ Collect for St. John the Evangelist's Day.

² Ezek. i. 28; compare Rev. iv. 3, x. 1.

do, and execute the things contained in this book ; the parties that so doubt, or diversely take anything, shall alway resort to the bishop of the diocese, who by his discretion shall take order for the quieting and appeasing of the same ; so that the same order be not contrary to anything contained in this book. And if the bishop of the diocese be in doubt, then he may send for the resolution thereof to the archbishop." How sadly this rule had been lost sight of, and its provisions set at nought and nullified, when men declared that they, individually, had no "doubt," and therefore were at liberty to reject any reference to the bishop,—entirely forgetting, meanwhile, that the rule provided not less distinctly for the case where parties "diversely take anything,"—I thought it well, my Reverend Brethren, to notice on a former occasion, at my Visitation four years ago ; and the condition in which we found ourselves last year seemed to make still more urgent the duty of recurrence, before it was too late, to the Church's wise and well-considered rule. And the reason why, I think, we may regard with increased hopefulness, and with no little thankfulness to an overruling Providence, the prospect before us at the present moment, as compared with the unknown and threatening legislation which seemed looming in our horizon at this time last year, is that the Public Worship Regulation Act, in the form which it finally assumed, lent its penal sanctions to the Church's own rule of

Episcopal judgment and discretion, as embodied in the Preface to the Prayer Book, rather than to some novel machinery, of doubtful principle and dangerous working, such as had at one time been not obscurely shadowed out, the first intimation of a Bill supposed to be in hand—by what authority communicated, or on what grounds resting, no one knew—in the organs of popular opinion.¹

It was to me, I need hardly say to you, my Reverend Brethren, a subject of deep satisfaction when I heard the Archbishop, in his address to the clerical and lay delegates assembled at the Diocesan Conference which he had called together, held at Maidstone on the 27th of January last, enforcing, with all the sanction of his high authority, in grave, deliberate, and weighty words, the same principles of action and line of conduct which I had endeavoured more feebly, in my humbler office, to commend to you, as that which I thought the sacred laws of the Church, and the special circumstances of the times, seemed alike to impress upon us as our duty and our only safety. I need not remind you how carefully and earnestly the Archbishop set himself to dissipate the apprehensions abroad of an ecclesiastical campaign which would open with the present session of Parliament, and to reassure the minds of Churchmen, clergy and laity together, by shewing the actual impossibility of any legislation this year affecting

¹ See Note B.

the Prayer Book, by reason of the necessarily late meeting of Convocation, postponed as it was by an early Easter to the 13th of this present month of April; how strongly he repelled, in the behalf of the great body of the clergy—*absolutely* in regard to the clergy of his own diocese, and generally with respect to the whole body—the sweeping charge of “lawlessness” which had, I may remind you, in a speech delivered at Birmingham a day or two before, been broadly cast upon them, but which, in his Grace’s opinion, rested only on a misguided few; how, while he declared plainly that the lines of truth which our Church at the Reformation had laid down could not with impunity be crossed, he maintained that within those limits there was room for large-hearted, brotherly concord. “I do hope and trust,” said the Archbishop, “that an exaggerated mode of viewing questions that ought to be looked at calmly will disappear from amongst us. There ever have been,” said he, “and to the end of the world there ever will be, diversities of opinion; but there are also united ideas of love towards our Lord and Saviour, and the souls for which He died.” The Archbishop urged, finally, upon all who heard him, “the importance of the time at which we are arrived. It is an important thing,” said his Grace, “to maintain this Established Church of England in its integrity in this realm. It is perfectly true,” he went on to observe, “as has been said by many, that there is no danger to

this Church Establishment, if its sons are true, and if the great parties which have ever existed in it will allow each other to judge according to the dictates of conscience, and serve heartily their common Lord. There will be no danger," said he, "from without, if we resist disunion from within; and I fully believe there is amongst us this real and hearty union."

It was impossible not to recognise in the Archbishop's words, as they fell, calmly but earnestly, from his lips, a kind and fatherly desire to do what in him lay to heal the wounds which might have been inflicted, beyond the design of those who uttered them, by words spoken or feelings called forth in the parliamentary conflict of the last session, or elsewhere; an unmistakeable anxiety, on his Grace's part, that any such words should not be taken up and turned into weapons against the clergy, and against the Church—nay, I may say, against the Crown itself, and the nation, consecrated and sanctified as they are by that sacred union between the Church and the State which it is the object of the Liberationists to destroy. They tell us, indeed, when they take up these weapons, wholesale charges of "lawlessness"—than which, they well know, they could find nothing more fitted to stir up the passions of a people, happily so full of reverence and regard for law as are the people of England—thanks be to God for it—they tell us, in their speeches, having "disestablish-

ment” for their sole object, the absorbing topic on occasions when, even to popular journalists, it seemed a subject altogether out of place, that they are “not going to make any ill-natured or unfair—indeed,” they “would say, not any attack at all upon the Church.”¹ There are those surely, my Reverend Brethren, of whom, whatever be their personal dispositions, however amiable and benevolent, it must be said, so far as their public and political principles and proceedings are concerned, that their “tender mercies are cruel.” They are fully aware, and profess, that “it is one of the gravest questions,” so they say, “which a people ever had to consider”—this question of “the abolition of the Established Church. “It is a question,” say they, “far more important and far more difficult than the question of the extension of the suffrage, or the redistribution of seats. It is a question,” they admit, “that goes down deep into the hearts”—most truly said—“that goes down deep into the hearts of hundreds of thousands of good men and women in this country, and” that “you cannot by a wrench make a great disturbance of this kind. I am not asking you,” said the orator, “or your constituencies, or any party or section of a party, to plunge into a violent agitation for the overthrow of the Established Church of England. I think it would be a great calamity indeed, that a great change like that should come

¹ See the *Times*, January 25, 1875.

of violent hatred and discussion,¹ and that it should be accomplished in a tempest which is almost like the turmoil of a great revolution. . . . It is not for me to join in any crusade against the Church. I have offered to you to-night my humble contribution to the discussion of the greatest question of our time. If I am able to form any just judgment upon it," it was thus the speaker concluded his oration, "I should say, that will be a great day for freedom in this country, and for Protestantism and Christianity, which shall witness the full enfranchisement of the Church within the realm of England."

We shall not, I think, my Reverend Brethren, be apt to be allured by these offers:

" . . . timeo Danaos et dona ferentes."²

We know what is the meaning of this "freedom" and this "enfranchisement:" "Protestantism" will gain nothing by it, nor "Christianity;" but Romanism may, and, still more surely, Scepticism and Atheism, Irreligion and Vice. Rome would gladly see, and so would Infidelity, the overthrow of the Established Church of England. But those who, in this professedly friendly spirit, desire to rob England of what is her richest and dearest inheritance, have no such likely way of attaining their object as if they can succeed in infusing mutual suspicion and distrust into the

¹ Qu. "dissension."

² Virgil, *Æn.* ii. 49.

minds of Churchmen, whether of the clergy or of the laity, or of the one against the other. It becomes us, therefore, I think, my Reverend Brethren, in the spirit of the earnest admonitions which our Archbishop has addressed to us, in the representative assembly of the clergy and laity of his diocese, to beware of the designs of those who would desire nothing better than to see us at variance. It is an unwelcome assemblage,—odious even in the view of men, when exhibited nakedly in the pure light, and set forth in the plain language of Holy Writ,—of the “six things” which the Lord doth hate, and the “seven” which “are an abomination unto Him.” There is the “proud look,” and the “lying tongue, and hands that shed innocent blood, an heart that deviseth wicked imaginations, feet that be swift in running to mischief, a false witness that speaketh lies;” but the crowning offence, the most grievous transgressor in His sight whose name is Love, is “he that soweth discord among brethren.”¹

Of the bonds of union which are among the most powerful to hold true Churchmen together at a time like the present, and one which gives tokens of daily increasing strength, is the Book of Common Prayer, in its integrity. The deliberations of the Clergy in our own diocese, held by the Diocesan’s express desire, with the request for a distinct

¹ Prov. vi. 16–19.

reply, and in other dioceses in like manner, have resulted for the most part, and so far as the great body of the clergy are concerned, in the expression of an earnest desire that the Prayer Book may remain intact. And the same feeling has been shown on the part of the laity, especially of communicant members of the Church, by the vast host of signatures attached to petitions embodying the like desire, which have been recently presented to Convocation. It is thought, I know, by some persons, that this is a merely temporary and accidental agreement between persons and parties of very different sentiments; that it is grounded on the conviction of both parties that the laws of the Church, embodied in the Prayer Book, as they stand at present, are on *their* side; and, therefore, that this concurrence or coalition will soon come to an end. I venture, my Reverend Brethren, to express a different opinion. I believe that, the more men turn their calm and deliberate attention to the subject, the more highly they will estimate the wisdom which, by the gift and blessing of God, has been shown in our Church's formularies, as preserved to us amidst the struggles through which she has passed; and the more strongly they will feel how great a peril we should incur in tampering in any way with them. And the more so, inasmuch as no alteration could be made in our Prayer Book without the concurrence and sanction of Parliament; and few true Churchmen, I

think, in their thoughtful hours, could contemplate, without alarm and dismay, the casting the most holy mysteries of our faith and ritual upon the stormy waters of parliamentary discussion. And I think it important to notice, that in some cases there has been, I conceive, a little misapprehension in regard to what by some persons has been sought. It was not, for the most part, I think, as has been supposed in these cases, an alteration of the law, that is, of the Rubrics of the Prayer Book, that was wished for; but rather a peaceful solution of present difficulties, whether by more satisfactory and final decisions of doubtful points of law, or by authoritative interpretations put forth by the Church herself; explanations of her mind and meaning, guarding from misapprehension any liberty already existing, or any rule which had given rise to objection; in some such way as in the thirtieth Canon respecting the use of the Cross in Baptism, or in the Synodical Declaration not long ago agreed upon in regard to the Athanasian Creed. Even, however, if the indisposition for change in the Prayer Book could be altogether accounted for by the persuasion entertained by opposite parties that the law of the Church, rightly interpreted, or finally pronounced, would be found to be on their side, or in favour of the liberty which they claimed as their rightful heritage, even on this supposition there would be the same ground for satisfaction and hope as when, at

a former troublous period in our Church's history, when doctrines on other points than those which are now debated, divided greatly men's minds, it was said, in the Declaration prefixed, by the royal authority of King Charles the First, to the Book of Articles; "That for the present, though some differences have been ill raised, yet we take comfort in this, that all clergymen have always most willingly subscribed to the Articles established, which is an argument to us that they all agree in the true, usual, literal meaning of the said Articles; and that even in those curious points in which the present differences lie, men of all sorts take the Articles of the Church of England to be for them, which is an argument again, that none of them intend any desertion of the Articles established." *Mutatis mutandis*, applying to the Liturgy what is here said specially of the Articles, this source of comfort and assurance would, at any rate, be ours now.¹

If, indeed, there be any so misguided and unfaithful that their heart is not with the Church to whose service they had devoted themselves, and whose sympathies are with another, a foreign communion; greatly as we must deplore their error, and unwilling as, for their own sakes, in common charity, we must feel, that they should drink more deeply of the cup of the enchantress, and put their necks hopelessly under the yoke of bondage which "neither our fathers nor we," of this Church of

¹ See Note C.

England, "were able to bear," in search of an infallibility which seems still, amidst all its towering and transcendent pretensions, to be as difficult to define as it ever was, and of a unity which is found, in fact, to be a vain shadow; yet if this be the mistress whom they desire to serve, we must sorrowfully say, Let them go; we crave not the presence of any who cannot be to us "an help or profit, but a shame and also a reproach."¹ And if, again, on the other hand, there be any whose sympathies are all with that platform the favourers of which, in past days, first cavilled at, and then rebelled against our "ecclesiastical polity," and at length triumphed in its overthrow; if there be those who are not content with our Prayer Book as it is, but would seek to reform it further, as they think it needs, after the principles and maxims of Geneva, of Calvin and Zuingle, with the fearful developments of unevangelical truth which have followed, in other lands, on the casting away of apostolical order, the rejection of the due authority of Christ's holy Church ending in "even denying the Lord that bought them;"² or again, if there be any who would be found extending so wide, as they think, their comprehensive charity as to break down the fences of the sacred vineyard, sacrificing "the Catholic faith" to what they would call "a truly catholic spirit;" we have no harsh or uncharitable words for them either, if only they will

¹ Isaiah xxx. 5.² 2 Peter ii. 1.

leave us and our Church alone. Let them go and “plant the tabernacles of their palaces”¹ as they see fit, if they think scorn of the “tents” of Jacob and the “tabernacles” of Israel,² spread forth in the valleys in due order, by their several signs, under the old sacred banners, in the holy warfare of Christ and of His Church.

And now, before I conclude, I would briefly advert to the latest action of the Church in the province of Canterbury, in the sessions of Convocation which terminated, for the present, ten days ago, to be resumed at the end of June. There was a very large attendance of members of the Lower House, including the Prolocutor, a hundred and seven in all; and the proceedings were characterised, I may truly say, in an eminent degree by the spirit which befits such an assembly of Christian clergy; the spirit which they had solemnly invoked in their united prayers, the spirit which the holy Apostle commends to us, “of power and love and soberness.”³ At the opening of the proceedings, the two Houses of Convocation had joined in partaking of those holy mysteries which Christ Himself ordained to be the sacred and special bond of union between His disciples: that which had been long desired was now for the first time obtained, and the Holy Communion was administered in West-

¹ Dan. xi. 45.

² Num. xxiv. 5-6.

³ 2 Tim. i. 7. Compare the Form of Consecration of Bishops.

minster Abbey, in Henry the Seventh's Chapel. There was a full discussion, calm, careful, and patient, in the temper of earnest men, restrained by mutual respect, and united by brotherly love. The time allowed of the consideration of one only of the two subjects which had been under the immediate view of the Committee whose Report was before the House ; and the result come to, with an unanimity which would hardly have been thought possible beforehand, was : "That this House, having regard to the fact of the existing widespread diversity of practice with regard to the position of the celebrant in the administration of the Holy Communion, is convinced that it will be most for the welfare of the Church that such diversity be not disturbed ; provided that, in cases where changes are made and disputes arise, it be left to the Ordinary to determine which practice shall be adopted. And further this House declares, that by this Resolution no sanction is intended to be given to any doctrine other than what is set forth in the Prayer Book and the Articles of the Church of England." Such a result, I need hardly say, could not have been arrived at, in such an assembly of earnest-minded men, representing so many shades of opinion within the Church's limits, except by means of much friendly communication of different parties, and free interchange of thought and feeling, of men ready to yield personal preferences, where it could be done without sacrifice of

principle, while maintaining what they severally regarded as sacred and important truth, or lawful and harmless liberty.

The Upper House, meanwhile, had adopted with the like unanimity the report of a Committee of the whole House, which, having gone through the Report of the Lower House of the last Convocation, upon the Fourth Report of the Rubrical Commission, left the Rubric prefixed to the Prayer of Consecration untouched. The unanimous resolution of the Lower House, it may, I think, without presumption be confidently anticipated, will strengthen greatly the hands of their lordships the Bishops of the province of Canterbury, if they desire, as we have reason to believe they do, to discourage strife and division, while they exercise the due authority of their office, recognised in the Act, and strengthened by its provisions, to take order by their discretion "for the quieting and appeasing of any diversity" in regard to which complaint may arise. It is a matter, assuredly, of great thankfulness, that the discretion of the Diocesan, though more than once, in the course of the Bill through Parliament, it appeared to be seriously threatened, was preserved intact; and it is, I think, extremely improbable that bishops generally, in their several dioceses, will, amidst the difficulties of the case, be at all disposed to rule authoritatively points in regard to which any reasonable doubt exists, or on which diversity of practice has, not unnaturally,

arisen. The order to be taken by the bishop is limited, in the Church's rule, as laid down in the Preface to the Prayer Book, by the express provision, "so that the same order be not contrary to anything contained in this Book." The bishop would, assuredly, on principle and from policy alike, abstain from any order which might possibly be found at variance with the true meaning of any rubric. The case of a doubt is further provided for by the provision, that "if the Bishop of the Diocese be in doubt, then he may send for the resolution of it to the Archbishop;" and we may feel tolerably sure, that our Archbishop would not authoritatively determine a doubtful point for the bishops of his province, while there was any room for question whether the Prayer Book had positively determined it. The Archbishop set himself to dispel the apprehensions of an ecclesiastical campaign to be opened this session in Parliament; and I may venture to say, in like manner, that I do not anticipate an ecclesiastical raid to commence on the first of July. Time is a great healer; the twelvemonth which was granted before the Act was to come into operation has been an essential benefit. I do not expect that there will be set on foot a systematic prosecution, undertaken in a harsh spirit, or a desire of reprisals; or any general attempt to do what a right reverend prelate designated as what would be simple "madness," rigidly "to enforce the rubrics all round."

I ventured, my Reverend Brethren, when I addressed you last year, having this and another case—that of the “Ornaments Rubric”—in mind, to observe that there were certain “rulings of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council which,” I apprehended, it was “simply impossible for the utmost legal ingenuity to reconcile satisfactorily with each other”; and, I must confess, it was with some satisfaction that, being present in the House of Lords, through the kindness of his Grace the Archbishop, throughout the long and anxious debates on the re-committal of the Bill, I heard what fell from the noble Lord on the woolsack in regard to these decisions. His lordship was referring to matters to which the amendments of which notice had been given by the Bishop of Peterborough were directed, proposing as they did what the Lord Chancellor described as “a neutralisation of a certain area of arguable ground.” He observed, that “the rubrics” had “been found to accommodate themselves so much to the habits of the people, that there would be considerable difficulty in interfering by legal proceedings for the purpose of putting a stop to them.” He declared further, that he was “bound to express” his “firm conviction that, whether they looked to Convocation, or whether they looked to Parliament, or whether they looked to the Church outside of Convocation, and outside of Parliament, the idea that in our days it would be

possible to arrive at any alteration for the settlement of the rubrics appeared to him to be out of the range of probability." Upon the subject immediately before us, as lately dealt with by Convocation, Lord Cairns went on to say, "As to the position of the minister in the Communion Service during the time of Consecration, that is a subject on which it will not be expected, nor would it be proper, that I should give any expression of opinion as to what the law on the subject may be. But I wish to call your Lordships' attention to the consideration of the question. I think," said his Lordship, "that there are in the Church of England a great number of persons, a large number of clergymen, who have no sympathy whatever with ritualists—I use a familiar expression—or ritualism, who have no sympathy with those extravagancies and those departures from the law which have been referred to in this House, and who yet feel themselves much distressed and disquieted by the present law on the subject of the position of the minister during the time of Consecration. Upon that subject," the Lord Chancellor went on to say, "there have been two decisions, more or less final, by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. I do not desire," said his Lordship, "to say one word as to the law of the question; but every one knows how extremely difficult it is for any person—for any layman, perhaps for any lawyer—to be satisfied that those two decisions

are reconcileable with each other. Moreover, in one of those cases no defence was made, and only one side was heard. Those decisions," said his Lordship, "I think, cannot be regarded as final."

It should further be borne in mind, I would add, to how great an extent the existing variety of practice arose out of those very decisions, rather than out of the practice of individual clergy in past times, or any continuous tradition, the satisfactory proof of which appears to me to be wanting. There are those who adopted the eastward position on finding it ruled, in one case, that the words "standing before the Table" applied to the whole Rubric, and who were placed in an embarrassing position when, in another case, it appeared to be ruled that the preposition "before" did not so apply, though the word "standing" did; unless, indeed, the words "before the Table" were taken in a not very obvious sense.¹ It was impossible, evidently, to anticipate what a third decision might be; the ground—the only ground—upon which an application for a rehearing in the undefended suit was refused, though it had been powerfully pleaded for by the present Lord Chief Justice of the Common Pleas (Lord Coleridge), and though the then Lord Chancellor (Lord Hatherley) had stated precedents in favour of such rehearing, was "the grave public mischief which, in the view of the Judicial Committee,

¹ See Note D.

would arise on any doubt being thrown on the finality of the decisions of the Committee;" and "their lordships" were accordingly, as they stated, "of opinion that *expediency* required that the prayer of the petition to the Judicial Committee should not be acceded to, but be refused with costs." I can easily understand how a sensible man, a churchwarden, consulted by the incumbent, in such a condition of things, might wisely and well recommend that no change should for the present be made: it would seem to such an one, perhaps, not a desirable thing that the minister should be seen veering round to different points of the compass, in his ministrations at the holy Table, in conformity with the "divers winds," not "of doctrine"—for whatever sense he might intend by different positions, or others might put upon them, the "doctrine" of the Church would remain the same—not of doctrine, therefore, but of the varying views of expediency in Judicial Committees of the Privy Council, bodies continually changing in their composition. And it is to be borne in mind, also, that it is not only one school of thought in the Church which, by varying judgments of the Courts, was liable to be exposed to the charge of undutifulness or disobedience. A recommendation of the surplice for preaching, with a view to uniformity of practice,—particularly in the Metropolis and its neighbourhood,—put forth by the joint authority of the Bishop of

London and the late Bishop of Winchester, was rejected at a large meeting held in London, on the ground—intelligible enough in this case also—that the matter had not yet been determined by any final decision of law. Only let us take care in these matters, my Reverend Brethren, that we weigh things in equal scales. The Wise Man, in his inspired wisdom, hath said, “Divers weights, and divers measures, both of them are alike abomination to the Lord.”¹ And “a greater than Solomon,” even our Divine Master and Lord, gave the commandment to the men of His time, and hath given it not less to us, “Judge not according to appearance, but judge righteous judgment.”²

There remains only one point in reference to the provisions of the new Act to which I think it important to call attention, in connection with the archdeacon’s office, and also with the office of the churchwarden. In the bill, as first brought in, the originator of proceedings under the Act might be the archdeacon, or the rural dean, or any single parishioner, “if he were of opinion, as regards the fabric and furniture of the Church, that any alterations in, or additions to, the fabric, ornaments, or furniture had been made without a faculty from the ordinary, authorising or confirming such

¹ Prov. xx. 10. Compare chap. xvi. 11. “A just weight and balance are the Lord’s; all the weights of the bag are his work.”

² St. John vii. 24.

alteration or addition ;” and similarly in regard to ornaments of the minister, services, rites, and ceremonies. It was felt by many, that a provision like this would put the rural dean in an unpleasant and invidious position ; that the office of the churchwarden was absolutely ignored, as was observed by a churchwarden, at my Visitation gathering at Sevenoaks last year, whose remarks I referred to in my place in Convocation, and reported also to the Archbishop ; and further, that the archdeacon also was put into a false position ; converted from a subordinate and concurrent Ordinary into an accuser ; put into the same category with a single aggrieved parishioner ; and all the authority which he is accustomed to exercise in lesser matters taken away, by the requirement of a faculty for the most trifling alteration made in the fabric, or the smallest piece of Church furniture supplied. The objections prevailed to the extent of leaving out the rural dean, inserting the churchwardens, or three parishioners ; and specifying that the ground of complaint in regard to the church should be, that alterations or additions had been made “without lawful authority.” The archdeacon remains as one who may, under the provisions of the Act, make a representation to the Bishop : but this is altogether voluntary ; he is not required to take any such part unless he thinks fit ; or if he prefer to use the legitimate influence of his office in another way. The Act is understood to be simply supplementary, and not to

supersede, or interfere with, any existing authority or jurisdiction. The Archdeacon, we know, has commonly been designated, in ecclesiastical language, the “eye” of the Bishop: but he is such, I take leave to observe, not in the sense of a spy or informer, but as one entrusted with an important function in the administration of Church discipline; by whose assistance, in his auxiliary and at the same time independent office, the Bishop may be relieved of lesser matters; specially in regard to the sacred fabrics, the care of the churches and churchyards, and all the vessels and furniture, and other arrangements for public worship. I do not anticipate or apprehend any interruption of the friendly and brotherly relations at present subsisting between the clergy and their archdeacons; and both they and the clergy, and their parishioners, will, I feel assured, increasingly recognize the office of the churchwardens as one which constitutes them the fitting representatives, in each parish, of the lay members of the Church; specially qualified by their appointment, the one by the incumbent, the other by the parishioners, to act together in the interests of both, to the maintenance of good order, harmony, and peace.

Let me conclude the words which I have spoken to you now, my Reverend Brethren,—speaking with undoubting confidence in the kindness with which you have ever received whatever suggestions the circumstances of the times, or the dangers which

beset us, or the hopes which, amidst them all, we seemed warranted in cherishing, have called forth,—let me conclude with the encouragement with which the holy Apostle wound up his affectionate exhortations to the Church at Corinth. The trials and difficulties amidst which we are called to fulfil our high commission are not greater than theirs were then ; there were divisions to be healed, errors to be corrected, offences to be removed, matters of conscience to be more charitably treated, the weak not condemning the strong, nor the strong setting at nought the weak ; false claims and rival pretensions to apostolical authority, or to the possession of the Spirit of Christ, to be put down, and true apostolical authority to be reasserted and vindicated ; discipline to be enforced, yet “in love, and in the spirit of meekness ;”¹ matters of controversy between brethren, which had been carried to the outer courts of the heathen, but which ought to be settled rather by the fatherly judgments of those whom Christ had appointed to rule in His Church² —“the Church” to which He had bidden them refer their differences and disputes, with the solemn promise given, “Verily I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven : and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.” “Where two or three are gathered together in My name, there am I in the midst of them.”³ Amidst all that there was, on

¹ 1 Cor. iv. 21.² 1 Cor. vi. 1–6.³ St. Matth. xviii. 15–20.

every side, to perplex and distress—for to the great Apostle also “without were fightings, within were fears,”¹—yet even then, as “a helper of” their “joy,”² he had words of comfort and hope for them, of holy confidence and calm rejoicing. “Finally, brethren,” said he, “farewell”—*χαίρετε*—go on your way rejoicing; or, as he said in a later epistle to others of his brethren, even from his prison at Rome, “Finally, brethren, rejoice in the Lord;” “Rejoice in the Lord alway; and again I will say, Rejoice.”³ The holy Apostle felt assuredly what had been expressed in the words of Nehemiah, the pious governor of Judah, in earlier days of trouble, to *his* brethren who, in the face of bitter opposition, or craft and subtlety of the adversaries leagued against them, were holding their weapons in one hand, while with the other they were building up the walls of their Jerusalem—“the joy of the Lord is your strength.” Even so spake the Apostle to his brethren at Corinth: “Finally, brethren, farewell. Be perfect, be of good comfort, be of one mind, live in peace; and the God of love and peace shall be with you. . . . The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all. Amen.”⁴

So be it now with us, my Reverend Brethren; and
 “To God only wise be glory, through Jesus Christ, for ever. Amen.”

¹ 2 Cor. vii. 5.

² Chap. i. 24.

³ Phil. iii. 1; iv. 4.

⁴ 2 Cor. xiii. 11-14.

NOTE A.

In the enumeration given in the Charge of works completed, or in hand, during the past year, reference has been made only to Churches built, enlarged, or restored. "The Canterbury Diocesan Church Building and Endowment Society," however, includes within its objects not only, as its title implies, the Endowment of small benefices, but also the building, purchase, or improvement of Parsonage Houses. In the Pastoral Letter issued by his Grace the Archbishop in behalf of the Society in January of last year, it is stated that in the nine years which have passed since its institution in January, 1865, in the course of which it has expended the sum of 20,424*l.*, "it has assisted to build, restore, or enlarge 61 Churches; to erect 7 Temporary Churches; to build, purchase, or improve 40 Parsonage Houses; and to increase the very small endowments of 19 Benefices—in the Diocese of Canterbury. It has also contributed annually a portion of its funds to the Incorporated Church Building Society, which Society continues to make liberal grants towards Church Building in the Diocese. In the Churches which have received the Diocesan Society's aid, additional accommodation has been provided for 16,842 persons. "For many years," the Archbishop's Pastoral Letter goes on to state, "there is little prospect of any diminution in the number of Applications for the Society's help. . . . It appears that at the present time there are at least 8 New Churches and 8 Mission Chapels urgently required in the Diocese. In addition to these, there are 25 Parishes in which the Churches are situated at a remote distance from a large proportion of the Parishioners. There are 79 Churches needing restoration or enlargement, besides many others in which the internal arrangements are very inconvenient and objectionable. In 60 Parishes there are no Parsonage Houses; in consequence of which the Incumbents live at a distance of from 1 to 9 miles from their Parishioners; and there are 16 Parsonage Houses which are, from their bad state of repair or inadequate accommodation, unfit for residence; whilst others are situated at a very inconvenient distance from

the Church and people. There are still 44 Benefices under 200*l.* a year; including 7 under 100*l.* a year, 19 above 100*l.* and under 150*l.*, and 18 above 150*l.* and under 200*l.*"

"With undiminished appreciation," says his Grace the Archbishop, "of the value of the Society to the Diocese, and unlessened confidence in the wise and impartial administration of the funds placed at its disposal, I commend it to your support."

NOTE B.

In the *Times* of Tuesday, March 10, 1874, appeared a leading article, which informed its readers of a "remedy" for the evils arising out of "the licence which now" prevailed in the Church in respect to the mode of celebrating Divine Service. "The nature of the remedy," it was said, "would appear obvious, though the practical development of it will be difficult. It was suggested by the Ritual Commission six years ago; but the form in which it was proposed was open to exception, and the recommendation was never acted upon. The Bishops, however," the article goes on, "have recurred to the idea in substance, and are of opinion that a remedy for pressing evils can only be provided by some simple, summary, and inexpensive process for securing obedience to the law. The Ritual Commission proposed that the Bishop, acting alone, should have power summarily to enforce established usage on certain matters then especially in dispute. It is now proposed to give *the new authority* a more general scope, but at the same time to establish it on a *broader basis* than the *mere discretion of the Bishop*. What is needed, indeed, is to render real the executive and discretionary power that the *Prayer Book* intended should reside in the Ordinary; but the Bishops very wisely consider it would be *more in accordance with the feelings*, in the *present age* of the Church and nation, if such a power were exercised on the advice of, and in co-operation with, a *diocesan board*, composed in equal proportions of clergy and laymen, to be *elected by the churchwardens* of each diocese. They think that the monition of the Ordinary, *issued on the notice of such a committee*, ought to have *summary* effect, and to be capable of

being enforced by sequestration of the benefice, as in the case of illegal non-residence, subject only to an appeal to the Archbishop of the province. Such a proposal," so the leading organ of popular opinion pronounced, "will in principle commend itself to the public, though the Bishops must be well aware of the danger they will have to avoid in carrying it into effect. The great difficulty will be to define the limits of the proposed discretion, and to prevent its operation being rendered vexatious. The Bishop would not be likely to attempt any interference with harmless departures from the rubrics, but it would be advisable for them to give some security for their intentions by *special clauses in the bill*. The proposal, however, is so moderate that the effort to promote it will be generally welcomed, *and in the present Parliament it will not fail to receive full discussion*. It offers means for a more cordial co-operation between clergy and laity; and it has at least become imperative to try whether the disagreements caused by rash innovations, which must otherwise destroy the peace of parishes and greatly impair the influence of the parochial clergy, cannot be prevented by some *simple legislation*."

The "simple legislation" thus mildly suggested, was on the very face of it, when looked into, what amounted to a complete revolution of the Church of England; and to whomsoever belonged the credit of the conception of the bill thus skilfully to be draughted, or of putting forth this *feeler* of the pulse of the English public, no more effectual method could by any ingenuity have been devised of exciting the apprehension of Churchmen, whether clergy or laity, than such an announcement of coming legislation. "The present Parliament," so hopefully looked to, had met, it will be borne in mind, on the preceding Thursday, the 5th of March. The Convocation of the Province of Canterbury, which, according to established custom, met on the day following (Friday, March 6), had been prorogued at once by the Bishop of London, acting for His Grace the President, to the 28th of April; the postponement of its usual meeting being in consequence of the Archbishop's indisposition.

The *Guardian* of March 11, observed, in reference to the sermon preached by the Dean of Ely at the opening of the Convocation, "It must be confessed that certain proposals which

are announced in the *Times* yesterday, as about to emanate from the Episcopal Bench, for the formation of a *new tribunal* to regulate the services of the Church, are likely to attract more attention than decanal utterances and admirable Latin." In its number of April 1, it informed its readers that the Archbishop of Canterbury had given notice that he would "on Monday the 20th of April, call the attention of the House of Lords 'to the present state of the laws regulating Divine Service in the Church.' In the meantime," the *Guardian* went on to say, "we are informed that *no detailed measure has as yet received the sanction of the Bishops; and the particulars of the proposals, when submitted to and approved by them, cannot be authoritatively known until a Bill is laid before the Legislature.*"

NOTE C.

I have quoted, in a preceding Note, from a leading article in the *Times* of March 10, 1874, in reference to anticipated legislation. I would add here an extract or two which I copy with satisfaction from a leading article in the same journal, of August 14, 1874, looking back on the legislation which had taken place, as dealt with by his Grace the Archbishop in a speech which had just been delivered by him at Canterbury (August 12) at the Annual Meeting of the Diocesan Church Building Society. The Archbishop, it was observed, had "doubtless accepted with pleasure an opportunity of . . . pleading for that mutual toleration between Clergy and Laity which can alone enable the Church to work harmoniously. It is only just to remember," it was said, "as the Archbishop reminds us, how much of what is most satisfactory in the present position of the Church is due to efforts on the part of the Clergy which were in great measure misunderstood, and also in some measure misguided. Where you have zeal, you have errors. As human nature goes, the two things are inseparable, and in this case it is more than usually natural that they should be combined. Few movements have been marked by so much energy, or have been more advantageous than that which, as the Archbishop says, has transformed within his lifetime the

character of English Church Services and English Public Worship. Nothing would be more interesting than to know the mere amount of money which, within a generation, has been lavished on the restoration of Churches and the improvement of Services. 'I suppose,' says the Archbishop, 'there is no one of my age here but looks back with a kind of shame to the sort of sermons which were preached, the sort of Clergymen that preached them, the sort of building in which they preached them, and the sort of psalmody with which the service was accompanied; and, remembering these, I am perfectly astonished the whole attachment of the people to the Church did not evaporate.' English people, indeed, are not quite so much influenced by externals as this statement implies; and justice is now rarely done to the vigour as well as piety of the Evangelical School, which at the commencement of the century maintained religious life in the Church. Men like Cecil and Simeon, who surrounded Wilberforce, were the representatives of a manly, even if a one-sided, theology to which it is often refreshing to recur amid the antiquarianisms and sentimentalisms of the present day. The first part of this century was far from being an age of intellectual decadence in England; and the Church was by no means excluded from the prevalent energy. It is a total delusion to imagine that theological and practical earnestness was dormant in the Church of England from the days of the Caroline Divines to those of the Oxford movement. Nor is it entirely to the Oxford movement that the improvement to which the Archbishop refers is due. Churches are not the only things in country villages which have felt the spur of recent progress. Every interest and every profession has been stirred by the diffusion of knowledge, the increase of locomotion, and the general spread of intelligence, which have marked the last quarter of a century. Just at the moment when this was beginning, a variety of influences, including that of a powerful school of theological thought, encouraged an ecclesiastical revival. If this age has been an innovating and reforming one, it has not less, in England, been an age for reviving and doing justice to the past. The men most interested in the future have been reviving every relic of old times, and endeavouring to make old stories, old rubrics, and old words live again with

their former significance. It is Dr. Newman himself who attributes no little influence in this respect to the novels of Sir Walter Scott. But Sir Walter did but represent the spirit of an age which, in this country at least, sought the means of a wholesome revolution in the revival of all the elements of its historic life. It is this impulse which has been restoring Churches, reanimating Formularies, and reviving old forms of devotion throughout the kingdom. Of course, it has led to abuses and excesses; it has been injudiciously indulged, and sometimes offensively intruded. It was moulded in great measure on an ecclesiastical theory, which itself was a revival, and has taken narrow forms. But, one thing with another—modern life with old principles, advance with retrogression, new things combined with old—the very face of the Church has been changed, and changed incalculably for the better. There is justice more especially in the Archbishop's statement that 'an immense amount of energy has been infused into the efforts of the Clergy, such, perhaps, as no other generation ever witnessed.' While doing justice to this zeal, the Archbishop at once appeals to the Clergy themselves to exert it with more consideration for the wishes of the Laity, and to the Laity to regard with tolerant consideration the exuberance of a well-intended impulse. . . . The improvement of which we have spoken has been made, to a vast extent, in the face of violent opposition from men who did not understand its meaning; and the contrast between an ordinary village church at the present day and one fifty years ago should undoubtedly be a plea for mutual consideration.

"It should dissipate misapprehensions on both sides that the Archbishop has thus done justice to the motives of each. But all that he has recently been doing is to insist that there must be a limit to the kind of restoration of which we have spoken. We reformed the Church three centuries ago [with discretion; and, while we revived some old things, there were some which were also old which we definitely abandoned. The Archbishop has expressed, as we have seen, his astonishment that the Church should have survived some things which prevailed fifty years ago. There have been worse times than that; and it may be profitable to ask what it can be which kept the Church alive

through every period of neglect and decay. There is, however, one thing which has survived all changes, and has asserted its supremacy over all schools of thought, and that is the Book of Common Prayer. In that volume, or rather in those devotions, Englishmen of all schools have found the solace of their troubles, and the encouragement of their doubts; it has been the bond of family life, and the key-note of private feeling. No such achievement, perhaps, is recorded in modern history as that which has attuned the hearts of a whole nation for ten generations to one spirit and tone of thought. It is this which has been too strong for bad Sermons and dull Services, and has always insured a spiritual and mental food for congregations. It is this, too, which recent innovation threatened, above all things, to obscure; and if the law just passed be effective, it will have no more valuable result than that of insuring the more general observance of the book which is the best embodiment of English traditions and sentiments. Within its limits no revivals are to be feared, and the greatest service which can be done to the Church in this emergency is to increase our familiarity with its wise and manly temper."

NOTE D.

In the Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Maidstone last year ("Measures and Means of Unity in the Church at the Present Time"), I ventured to say, that it had "come to pass, by a strange sort of fatality, that rubrics touching on points for delicate treatment, and which, *by the light of history carefully studied, may be proved, perhaps, to have been left designedly in some degree open, and therefore in a like degree ambiguous*, have been submitted to the hard handling of courts of law, when they were intended rather for the gentle 'discretion' of Fathers in Christ; while, on the other hand, the spirit of private judgment has been let to have free scope in the wholesale substitution of services and ceremonial which by no possibility of interpretation could be brought under the provisions of our own Prayer Book" (pp, 31, 32). Of the latter part of this statement it is, unhappily, quite unnecessary, I conceive, to bring proofs or give

instances: the former part it is only proper, I think, under the peculiar circumstances of the present time, to endeavour, as briefly and summarily as may be, to substantiate or illustrate.

It will be borne in mind that, by the provisions of the recent Act ("Public Worship Regulation Act"), section 8, "the archdeacon of the archdeaconry," as also "a churchwarden of the parish, or any three parishioners," may make a representation to the Bishop, with a view to proceedings under the Act," if he shall be *of opinion (inter alia)*

"(3.) That the incumbent has within the preceding twelve months failed to observe, or, to cause to be observed, *the directions* contained in the Book of Common Prayer relating to the performance of the services, rites, and ceremonies ordered by the said book, or has made or permitted to be made *any unlawful addition to, alteration of, or omission from* such services, rites, and ceremonies."

The Archdeacon, as has been observed in the body of the preceding Charge (p. 37), is simply *empowered* by the Act thus to proceed; it is not *obligatory* on him to do so; but it is obvious that, under very conceivable circumstances, he might feel himself strongly called upon, and, in fact, obliged to act, one way or another; and in order thereto, to make up his mind, to form an "*opinion*," whether such and such things were, or were not, "*unlawful*." He might also, not unnaturally, be called upon by a churchwarden to assist him in forming *his* "*opinion*:" the "*three parishioners*" are, perhaps, in many places, less likely to have any doubts, or to desire any help to make up their opinion on points of Church law. But even they might possibly seek, in matters where different parties "*diversely take*" anything, to have an opinion to aid them, before they publicly declare their own in a formal representation to the Bishop. And in any case, amidst the present "*confusions*" in regard to the apparently conflicting decisions of courts of law, and with the liability to proceedings being taken against any clergyman any day after the 1st of July, now instant, the clergy have something like a rightful claim—I feel as if I must fairly admit, in regard to the clergy of my own Archdeaconry—to know what the "*opinion*" of their Archdeacon—as to the course he ought to take on these questionable points, would be. I should not, I

trust, appear guilty of any presumption in the eyes of legal authorities, if I endeavoured to mark out for myself, as best I might, and make known to those concerned, the lines of what seemed to me the course of duty. I wish to encumber the matter as little as possible with details or elaborate arguments, and to state, as concisely as may be, what I conceive to be the salient points.

1. In regard to the position of the celebrant during the Prayer of Consecration. The Rubric runs thus :

“When the Priest, standing before the Table, hath so ordered the Bread and Wine, that he may with the more readiness and decency break the Bread before the people, and take the Cup into his hands, he shall say the Prayer of Consecration, as followeth.”

The question to be determined, obviously, is, whether the words “standing before the Table” apply to the whole Rubric, including, that is, the saying of the Prayer, or whether they apply only to the ordering the Bread and Wine, with which they are immediately connected. It may, perhaps, tend to make the question clearer if the Rubric be resolved into its two portions, thus :

“The Priest, standing before the Table, shall so order the Bread and Wine, &c., and then he shall say the Prayer of Consecration, &c.”

This is clearly the same thing. The first question is, what is meant by “standing *before* the Table.” This, I think, is put beyond all reasonable doubt by a Rubric in the Form of Solemnization of Matrimony. The Minister or Clerks are in a previous Rubric directed to say or sing a certain Psalm, “going to the Lord’s Table :” then follows this Rubric :

“The Psalm ended, and the Man and the Woman kneeling *before* the Lord’s Table, the Priest standing at the Table, and turning his face towards them, shall say,”—

Here kneeling “*before* the Lord’s Table” clearly means kneeling in *front* of the Table, looking towards it ; the Priest is standing “*at* the Table,” which by the light of other Rubrics means at the North side : only in this case, as the prayers that follow are of the nature of a Blessing, he is directed to say the prayers, “turning his face towards them,” and not, as he naturally would

do, if not so directed, when "standing at the Table," turning towards it.

There is no other instance, that I am aware of, in which the expression "standing *before* the Table" occurs: and its meaning here is sufficiently distinct. It is elsewhere said, "The Priest standing *at* the North side of the Table, shall say the Lord's Prayer," &c. "Then shall the Priest, turning to the people, rehearse," &c. "Then shall follow one of these two Collects for the Queen, the Priest standing as before," that is, clearly, standing as before on the North side, and turning to the Lord's Table. After the Confession, "Then shall the Priest . . . stand up, and turning himself to the people, pronounce this Absolution"—just as in the Marriage Service.—"Then shall the Priest say" the "comfortable words," of course still turning to the people, and in the words addressed to them, "Lift up your hearts," &c. "Then shall the Priest turn to the Lord's Table and say,—It is very meet," &c. "Then shall the Priest, kneeling down *at* the Lord's Table, say,—We do not presume," &c.; the "Prayer of humble access" which follows being emphatically a prayer that is said *in the name of all them* that shall receive the Communion. But it is to be said "kneeling down *at* the Lord's Table," *not* "before the Table;" the preposition "before" being distinctively used only in the first clause of the Rubric in question, and in the Rubric in the Marriage Service. The conclusion seems to me, I must confess, abundantly clear. The Priest is to stand not "at" but "before," i. e. in *front* of the Table, while he orders the Bread and Wine. By the light of the other Rubric, as I conceive it, and comparing these two with all the rest, I cannot think it can possibly be maintained, "that the words 'before the Table' do not necessarily mean 'between the Table and the people,' and are not intended to limit to any side." The words are, surely, as *limiting* as those in the Marriage Service.

If any further illustration were necessary, it would be supplied by the Coronation Service. We find there the Rubric, "At the commencement of the Anthem, the Queen rising from her devotions goes *before* the Altar,¹ attended by her supporters," for

¹ The use of the word Altar makes obviously no difference; the position of the Archbishop is the same; the expression, "the Lord's Table," is also used in the same Service.

the Anointing. After that "the Queen kneeleth down at the Faldstool, and the Archbishop *standing on the North side of the Altar*, saith this Prayer or Blessing over Her." We could not have a more perfect illustration of the Rubric in the Marriage Service, and of the other Rubric by implication.

In a later Rubric, at "the putting on of the Crown," it is said, "The Archbishop, standing *before* the Altar, taketh the Crown into his hands, and laying it again before him upon the Altar, saith ;—O God, who crownest thy faithful servants with mercy and lovingkindness ; Look down upon this Thy servant Victoria, our Queen, who now in lowly devotion boweth her head to Thy Divine Majesty ;" &c.

There can, surely, be no doubt as to the meaning of this : the Queen was kneeling "before"—in front of—the Altar or Lord's Table ; the Archbishop, now "standing before the Altar, takes the Crown into his hands," and then "laying it again before him upon the Altar"—placing it "before him," in his appointed place for supplication and blessing,—says the Prayer—the solemn Prayer, as it may be termed, of Coronation. The Crown had been placed, no doubt, in the middle of the Altar : this Rubric provided for the more conveniently placing it immediately before the Archbishop in connexion with the words of the Prayer, and, at the same time, in sight of the Queen and her assembled people.

The precise point, however, now before us is the true interpretation of the words "standing before the Table." And that, as used in the Prayer of Consecration in the Communion Office, the word "before" means "in front of" (as that expression would be commonly understood) seems to me to be put beyond the reach of legitimate doubt. I purposely abstain from using the phrase, "the eastward position," because of the confusion which it creates, in speaking of churches, like St. Peter's at Rome, where the Altar stands westward ; and also because there is no such special significance in the idea of turning to the east in this Service, as there was from the earliest times undoubtedly in connexion with the saying of the Creed.

The question, then, that remains is—Do the words "standing before the Table" apply to the whole Rubric, or simply to the act of ordering the elements for Consecration ? Grammatically

the participial clause "standing before the Table" would seem to qualify, and belong to, the direction concerning the ordering of the Bread and Wine; and the traditional interpretation has, till of late, so regarded it. Wheatly, who published his "Rational Illustration of the Book of Common Prayer" in 1710, and who till recent times was a prime authority in these matters, says, "As to those words 'standing before the Table,' I am of opinion that they only relate to the posture of the Minister, whilst he is ordering the Elements." "If it be asked, whether the Priest is to say this Prayer standing before the Table, or at the North-end of it; I answer, At the North-end of it: for according to the rules of grammar, the participle 'standing' must refer to the verb 'ordered,' and not to the verb 'say.' So that whilst the Priest is ordering the Bread and Wine, he is to stand 'before the Table:' but when he says the Prayer, he is to stand so as 'that he may with the more readiness and decency break the bread before the people,' which must be on the North-side. For if he stood 'before' the Table, his body would hinder the people from seeing: so that he must not stand there; and consequently he must stand on the North-side; there being, in our present Rubric, no other place mentioned for performing any part of this Office."

This point is treated, in the decision in the Purchas case, as "not the most important, but the most difficult question. Our opinion is that of Wheatly, &c." So the judgment has been printed, repeatedly, even in the third edition of the *Six Judgments*, by Mr. W. G. Brooke; but it appears that it ought to have been, "*One* opinion is that of Wheatly"; and it is added that "this" (moving to the West-side for this special purpose) "would be needless, if the elements were so placed on the Table as that the Priest could 'with readiness and decency' order them from the North-side, as is often done." This, however, is what I believe, as matter of fact, has never been done.

Where the Rubric has been duly observed which directs that, after the offering of the Alms, "when there is a Communion, the Priest shall then place upon the Table so much Bread and Wine as he shall deem sufficient," the sacred Elements have, naturally and of course, been placed, where the Alms had been placed, in the middle of the Table; and in churches of less

rubrical practice—I describe them thus, in the desire to avoid any party designations—where the Elements have been placed, by the clerk or sexton, on the Holy Table before the beginning of Morning Prayer, they have been placed, as naturally and as a matter of course, in the middle of the Table, covered with a fair linen cloth. It was done so in a church which might be taken as a “representative” one in the neighbourhood of London, and the usages of which I can recollect more than fifty years ago, and which so continued for five and twenty years; and this was, I believe, the usual practice in such churches. If this is to be regarded as “the most difficult question” in the case, I must confess that this, the traditional, solution of the Rubric, in regard to “standing before the Table” seems to me to meet all difficulty in the matter.

But a “difficulty” was introduced into the question by the decision in the case of *Martin v. Mackonochie* (1868). It was one of the charges in that case, “that the Respondent, after commencing the Prayer of Consecration standing, paused in the middle of the Prayer, knelt down, inclining, or prostrating, his head towards the ground, and then, rising up again, continued the Prayer standing.” In dealing with this charge it was said, “Their Lordships entertain no doubt on the construction of this Rubric, that the Priest is intended to continue in one posture during the Prayer, and not to change from standing to kneeling, or *vice versâ*; and it appears to them equally certain that the Priest is intended to stand, and not to kneel.” This decision might well have been maintained, if necessary, on the ground that, if any such a special act of genuflection, or adoration, had been intended to take place in the midst of the Prayer, a direction, we might undoubtedly have expected, would have been inserted, in the same way as with regard to the manual acts ordered in the course of the Prayer. And, again, that the posture of the Priest while saying this Prayer was to be standing and not kneeling, might have been maintained on the ground taken by Wheatly, against Dr. Nicholls’ “opinion that it ought to be said by the Minister on his knees, because it is a prayer”; Wheatly’s arguments being drawn not from the rubric in question, which he is of opinion does not determine it, but from the consideration of the whole Service, and from the manifest

impropriety of the posture of kneeling for the Priest while performing an act of authority, as the consecrating of the elements must be allowed to be."

But the Report of the Judicial Committee went on to say, "They think that the words 'standing before the Table' *apply to the whole sentence*; and they think this is made more apparent by the consideration, that acts are to be done by the Priest before the people as the Prayer proceeds (such as taking the paten and chalice into his hands, breaking the Bread, and laying his hand on the various vessels), which could only be done in the act of standing." Whether this was a conclusive argument or not, the Judicial Committee thus ruled, "that the words 'standing before the Table' apply to the whole sentence," and therefore to the whole time of saying the Prayer of Consecration.

Upon the strength of this decision, many of the Clergy, with the late Bishop Wilberforce, then Bishop of Oxford, at their head, adopted the practice of "standing before the Table" through the whole Prayer, and not simply while ordering the elements. And when the case of *Hebbert v. Purchas* came before the Arches Court, the learned Judge, as is said in the latest Report of the Judicial Committee (1871), briefly observed, "The question appears to me to have been settled by the Privy Council in the case of *Martin v. Mackonechie*."

The Judgment in this case had been pronounced on March 28, 1868. On February 3, 1870, two years after, the Judge of the Arches Court, by an Interlocutory Decree, gave sentence in the case of *Hebbert v. Purchas*, condemning the Defendant in costs; but not in regard to certain charges, one of these being in reference to the position of the Celebrant. On this point, therefore, the Clergy might naturally have concluded that, in the view of the Archbishop's Court, as well as in the view of the Judicial Committee which it adopted, it was ruled that the words "standing before the Table" were to be understood as referring to the whole Rubric; or in other words, that the Priest was to stand before the Table, not simply while he ordered the elements, but while he said the whole Prayer.

But when, on February 23, 1871, the Judgment of the Judicial Committee was delivered, it appeared to rule the question quite otherwise. With reference to what the Dean of the Arches had

said, the Committee went on to say, that "The question before their Lordships in that case was as to the posture, and not as to the position of the Minister." The passage in the Judgment, it is said, "refers to posture or attitude from beginning to end, and not to position with reference to the sides of the Table." "The question of position was not before their Lordships; if it had been, no doubt, the passage would have been conceived differently, and the question of position expressly settled." But however the passage was conceived, it must be admitted that, when it was ruled that the words of the Rubric "standing before the Table" applied to the whole sentence, and an argument in support of this view was drawn from the consideration of the acts to be done by the Priest as the Prayer proceeds, it is extremely difficult to comprehend that the question of position was not involved. To the simple understanding of plain Englishmen it would undoubtedly appear, that the least that could be said on the matter was what was said by the learned Head of the Law in his place in the House of Lords, as quoted in the preceding Charge: "Every one knows how extremely difficult it is for any person—for any layman, perhaps for any lawyer—to be satisfied that those two decisions are reconcilable with each other." It is very conceivable, that whoever drafted the passage might have drawn it somewhat differently, if he had had in view the application which would be made of it: but this is another question. In the one Judgment it was held that the words "standing before the Table" applied to the whole Rubric, regulating the posture throughout the whole Prayer; in the other Judgment, that they did not; that the Priest was to be "standing" throughout, but not "before the Table." Only, it seems, we may adopt what must surely be regarded as a not very natural interpretation of the words "before the Table." "Their Lordships," it would appear, "incline to think, that the Rubric was purposely framed so as not to direct or insist on a change of position in the Minister which might be needless; though it does direct a change of posture from kneeling to standing"; and as before quoted, they think "that the words 'before the Table' do not necessarily mean 'between the Table and the people,' and are not intended to limit to any side." Then neither do they necessarily mean, it may be argued, on the North-side, any

more than on the West-side : they would simply direct that the Priest is to stand, having been kneeling before. It is somewhat difficult, on this showing, to see why the Rubric was altered at all at the last Review. It stood before : "Then the Priest standing up shall say as followeth."

But there are yet further *data* for determining the true interpretation of the Rubric. The Rubric was clearly the work of Bishop Cosin. The former Rubric, as we have seen, was, "Then the Priest, standing up, shall say as followeth." Among the alterations suggested by Cosin was this : "When the Priest standing before the Table, hath so ordered the Bread and Wine that he may with the more readiness and decency break the Bread before the people, and take the Cup into his hands, he shall say as followeth." The Bishops adopted this suggestion with this only alteration, that the last clause should stand thus : "he shall say the Prayer of Consecration as followeth."

Now, it may be asked, what was the object of this more precise and elaborate Rubric? Evidently, on the face of it, to secure "the more readiness and decency." What, then, was the hindrance of readiness, and lack of decency, which it was to prevent? The previous history of Bishop Wren, of Archbishop Laud, and of Bishop Cosin himself, seems, clearly enough, to give the answer.

"When Bishop Wren was impeached in the House of Lords (A.D. 1636), for consecrating the elements on the West-side of the Table, he answered that he stood at the North-side at all the rest of the Service, except at the Prayer of Consecration. 'He humbly conceiveth it is a plain demonstration that he came to the West-side only for the more *conveniency* of executing his office, and no way in any superstition, much less in any imitation of the Romish priests; for they place themselves there at all the service before, and at all after, with no less strictness than at the time of consecrating the bread and wine.'" Still more explicitly speaks Archbishop Laud, on *his* trial. He had been charged with the part he had taken in regard to the Scottish Prayer Book, which had introduced a provision for more "ease and decency" in ministering. "And I protest," said he, "in the presence of Almighty God, I know of no other intention herein than this." It was because it was "hard for the

presbyter to avoid the *unseemly* disordering of something or other that was before him, perhaps the very Elements themselves." Whatever was the "part of the Holy Table" indicated in the Scottish Rubric, this was its special object and end, that the presbyter consecrating might "*with the more ease and decency* use both his hands." Bishop Cosin himself, as Archdeacon of the East Riding, in his Visitation Articles long before (in 1627), had distinctly recognised the North-side as the place where the Minister would be standing, and therefore liable to this *inconvenience*, or *indecentcy*. He had inquired concerning the "Parson, Vicar, or Curate," "Doth he stand at the *North side of the Table*, and perform *all things there*, but when he hath special cause to remove from it, as in reading and preaching upon the Gospel, or in delivering the Sacrament to the Communicants, or other occasions of the like nature?" For in regard to the elements, *where* they would be placed the next question clearly shows. The Bishop asks, "Doth he carefully see to the preparation of the Bread and Wine before every Communion, that they be pure and wholesome, *that they be decently presented and placed upon the Table*," &c.¹

The intention of the Rubric, as proposed by Bishop Cosin, is now, I think, sufficiently plain; viz. to provide for the Priest's so ordering the Elements, placed as they would be at the time of the Offertory in the midst of the Table, as that there should be no inconvenient or unseemly leaning over from the North-side so as to reach them, at the time of Consecration. There can be no manner of doubt that, in 1660, the position of the Holy Table North and South was distinctly contemplated, and expressly provided for. In his Articles of Inquiry, as Bishop of Durham, in 1662, Bishop Cosin asks: "Is there a partition between your Church and your Chancel, a comely fair Table there, *placed at the upper part thereof*, for the administration of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper?" There is no doubt what this means, viz. the position of the Table against the East wall of the Chancel, North and South: the new Rubric had obviated the inconvenience, before felt, in regard to the placing of the Elements; and the Rubric which Bishop Cosin had enforced, as Archdeacon, before the Troubles would now with greater "readi-

¹ Bishop COSIN'S *Correspondence*, vol. i., p. 118.

ness and decency" be observed. It is worthy of remark that, whereas, in the Diocese of Durham, as was observed by Archdeacon Sharp, the universal practice, in the diocese, of wearing the surplice in preaching was the result of Bishop Cosin's rule and practice, there is not a trace, in the history of the Diocese of Durham, of any usage of saying the Prayer of Consecration otherwise than on the North-side.

I know it has been argued that Bishop Cosin's words, "on other occasions of the like nature," might include the whole time of saying the Prayer of Consecration. I cannot think this is a natural inference from the words. Surely the words referred to such exceptions,—of a few moments only in duration,—as offering the alms, and placing the elements on the Holy Table; the same sort of "special cause" for removing from the North side as would be the going to the usual place to read the Gospel, to preach the Sermon, or to administer the elements to the Communicants.

If any further evidence were necessary—which I hardly think it can be—as to the sense in which Bishop Cosin understood the words in the Rubric of which he was himself the author, "*standing before the Table*," it would be supplied by other Rubrics which he suggested, but which were not adopted, such as the following: "If any of the Bread or Wine remain, &c. . . . the Priest and such other of the Communicants as he shall then call unto him *before the Lord's Table*, shall there . . . reverently eat and drink the same." On the other hand, in the Order of Confirmation, "Then shall they all kneel, and the Bishop standing *at the Lord's Table* shall proceed and say, Our help, &c." Again, in the Service for the Churching of Women, "The woman . . . shall kneel down in some convenient place, appointed unto her by the Minister, *before the holy Table*; at which he standing shall thus direct his speech unto her, Forasmuch, &c." Here we have the two combined; putting beyond all doubt what Bishop Cosin meant by "*standing before the Table*," as contradistinguished from standing "*at the North-side*." (It may be observed here that the 127th Psalm was inserted at Bishop Cosin's suggestion.) So again, in the Order of Consecration of Bishops, "Then the Archbishop and Bishops present shall lay their hands upon the head of the

elected Bishop, humbly kneeling *before the Lord's Table*, the Archbishop saying," &c. It stands, in our present Prayer Book, "kneeling *before them*."

With Bishop Cosin's Rubric, which, as we have seen, was adopted, it may be well to compare Bishop Wren's suggested Rubric, which closely resembled it. But it must first be observed that Bishop Wren had proposed that, before the "Prayer of humble access," the Bread and Wine should "be presented by the Churchwardens, or some other for them, to the Priest, who," it was added, "shall with due reverence set as much thereof . . . as he shall conceive there will then be use of upon the Lord's Board . . . and then he kneeling down *before the Table* shall in the name of all present say, We do not presume," &c. The form of Rubric which Bishop Wren suggested to stand before the Prayer of Consecration was this: "Then the Priest standing *before the Table* shall so order and set the Bread and Wine that, while he is pronouncing the following Collect, he may readily take the Bread and break it, and also take the Cup to pour into it (if he pour it not before), and then he shall say"—This, it will be observed, hardly differs from Bishop Cosin's—our present Rubric—save that it resolves the whole Rubric into its two constituent clauses, as was done in the opening of this Note; the object of the Rubric being equally clear with Bishop Cosin's, viz. to prevent an inconvenience which they had both in their earlier troubles experienced. And, as in regard to Bishop Cosin's suggestions, so in regard to Bishop Wren's, conceived in precisely the same spirit, there is like evidence corroborative of his mind and meaning in the distinctive phrases employed. Thus, in the Marriage Service, he proposed this Rubric: "When the Psalm is ended, the Priest, as he stands *at the Holy Table*, *but* turning his face towards the married couple, shall say," &c. And, in the Churching of Women, "The woman, decently veiled, shall at the beginning of the Communion Service be appointed where to kneel, not far from the Holy Table; *at which* the Priest standing shall thus direct his speech to her: Forasmuch," &c. The final Rubric there he proposed should stand thus: "The Priest here proceedeth to the Communion Service, And if there be a Communion," &c. There cannot, I think, be a doubt what Bishop Wren and Bishop Cosin mean by standing

or kneeling "before the Table," and, on the other hand, standing *at* the Table, clearly on the North-side, whether his face were turned to the Holy Table in prayer, or to those who were kneeling before the Table in blessing.

It has been supposed that the Bishops and the Convocation, at the last Review, anticipated that it would be a long time before the "altarwise" position could be obtained; but I confess I find no signs of this. There might be country Churches where the Table remained standing in the midst of the Chancel, or at its "hither end," and even standing east and west; but I cannot believe that the Rubric, newly introduced, was intended to provide for such cases, to the injury, in fact, of others, the great majority. It seems to me most clearly to contemplate such a position of the Holy Table as that the Elements, placed where they naturally would be placed upon it in an act of oblation, might require some special provision, in regard to the Priest, in order to an unimpeded and seemly—a "ready and decent"—action in the act of Consecration about to follow.

From the time when this Rubric was enacted, during the last two hundred years, down to the days of the present generation, the North-side position of the Priest, with the qualifications above noticed, has been, I believe, the constant and unvarying usage in all our Cathedrals and College Chapels, till within the last few years. While, however, this was the undoubtedly prevailing practice, and that which was, as I conceive, in most exact accordance with the intentions of the Revisers, I am disposed—reverting now to what I began with, in regard to the Rubric and its two component parts—to think that the second clause was left designedly open, so as not absolutely to exclude, on occasion perchance arising, another interpretation. The Rubric, I conceive, unmistakeably directs the Priest to be standing before the Table, that is, in front of it (as the words would commonly be understood), while he orders the Bread and Wine, and then "he shall say the Prayer of Consecration;" but, I think, it is not distinctly said what his position shall be while he says it; though at the same time I have no doubt that what was contemplated and intended was that he should stand "as before," in other acts of prayer in the course of the Communion

Service, and especially in the solemn form of supplication and intercession which was to be said immediately after the gifts were laid on the holy Table—I mean the Prayer for the Church Militant. For that Prayer is, in fact, part of the same Prayer of Consecration, for certain wise and sufficient reasons, as it appeared to our Reformers, placed where it is—an arrangement, for good reasons, doubtless, in like manner not disturbed at the last Review. The Judicial Committee, as has been already observed, “incline to think that the Rubric was purposely framed so as *not to direct* or *insist on* a change of position in the minister, which might be needless.” I venture to think, in a somewhat similar sense, that the Rubric was purposely framed so as not absolutely to require a change of position after the ordering of the elements, and before the saying of the Prayer of Consecration. Bishop Cosin, and his fellow-revisers, were certainly in favour of uniformity: they would, I cannot doubt, have deprecated and discouraged a diversity of practice which was capable of being made a badge of party, or a symbol of division. They were, also—however men may sometimes have regarded them, and their counsels and acts—dealing very considerately and tenderly with men’s consciences and feelings.

In regard to the position of the celebrant during the Prayer of Consecration, the usage of other Churches would doubtless greatly influence them, in like manner as it has mainly influenced men in these days, against a prohibition which might seem condemnatory of other branches of the Church Catholic, or of any insulating effect in regard to our own, in matters where no erroneous doctrine was concerned. It has been in other things, as it is in regard to “the lawful use of the Cross in Baptism,” as “explained” in the 30th Canon. “It must be confessed,” as is there said, “that in process of time the Sign of the Cross was greatly abused in the Church of Rome, especially after that corruption of Popery had once possessed it. But the abuse of a thing doth not take away the lawful use of it. Nay, so far was it from the purpose of the Church of England to forsake and reject the Churches of Italy, France, Spain, Germany, or other such like Churches, in all things which they held and practised, that, as the Apology of the Church of England confesseth, it doth with reverence retain those ceremonies

which do neither endamage the Church of God, nor offend the minds of sober men; only departing from them in those particular points, wherein they were fallen both from themselves in their ancient integrity, and from the Apostolic Churches which were their first founders." Those who, under the influence of such a feeling, in regard to the position of the celebrant in other Churches, wished that position to be at least uncondemned, would have it to plead that there was in the Rubric no absolute direction forbidding it; while the considerations already brought forward would rather justify those who adhered to the generally received and established custom. The recent Resolution of the Lower House of Convocation reflects faithfully, as I am thankful to feel, this principle of procedure; the security against division at home—a paramount duty, assuredly, even when we are thinking of foreign Churches, in the spirit of brotherly unity—being secured by the provision that wherever, in consequence of any change that is made, a dispute arises, "it shall be left to the Ordinary to determine what practice shall be adopted."

In the case of *Hebbert v. Purchas*, as has been already stated, no defence was made. "In default of argument on the Respondent's side," the Judicial Committee say, "they have been *somewhat aided* by a large mass of controversial literature, which shows how much interest this question excites, and which has probably left few of the facts unnoticed." A very undue importance, however, as was not unlikely in a "mass of controversial literature," has been attached to certain facts, which on careful consideration appear to affect the question very little. Of this character is the fact that, by Queen Elizabeth's Injunctions, at the time of Communion the Table was to be "so placed in good sort within the chancel as thereby the Minister may be more conveniently heard in his prayer and ministration, and the communicants also more conveniently, and in more number communicate with the said Minister." It has been supposed that this necessarily implied a placing of the Table East and West, so that the Minister, standing on the North-side, would be "before the Table," i. e. in front of the longer side of the Table; and that the wording of the Rubric was grounded on this fact. But, as has already, I conceive, been sufficiently proved,

the words, "before the Table" have no reference to the longer or shorter side of the Table; nor does it follow that, because the Table, in time of Communion, was brought from the place where the altar stood, at the East end of the Chancel, it was therefore necessarily placed lengthwise having its shorter sides East and West. Moreover, as the Judicial Committee observe, "before the time of the Revision of 1662, the custom of placing the Table along the east wall was becoming general; and it may fairly be said that the Revisers must have had this in view." It is out of the question to suppose, that the Bishops and Divines of the Restoration contemplated for a moment any but a North and South position of the Table. It may also be observed, that the old Communion Tables were, commonly, nearly as wide as they were long; in fact, not far from being square; at all events, oblong, in form such as we are acquainted with in the definitions and diagrams of the familiar friend of our early days, Euclid, who talked of "an oblong" as "that which has all its angles right angles, but has not all its *sides* equal;" while the "square" was "that which has all its *sides* equal, and all its angles right angles." In fact, whether these Tables, and especially Tables so shaped, were placed lengthwise or crosswise "within the chancel," or even in the body of the Church, if so it were, would make very little difference, in appearance, to the congregation; the Minister would be seen "standing on the North-side," whether it were a little longer or a little shorter than the other side; and perhaps not many would know which side of the Table was turned to them, it being simply a question of convenience and space.

But to interpret standing "before the Table"—or, in front of the Table, which is clearly the same thing—to mean standing sideways to the eye of the congregation, and at what they would more naturally call the side of the Table, and this simply because that side of the Table was a few inches longer than the other, is a thing which has not in its favour a particle of authority derivable from the language of any Rubric, and as little—it would, I think, be generally pronounced—from the common language of Englishmen. Queen Elizabeth's Injunction, it will be observed, directed the Table at Communion Service to be placed *in the Chancel*—not, as has been very com-

monly supposed, in the body of the Church, where, it is imagined,—owing to pews, I presume,—the Table could not stand north and south. What the Puritans so vehemently objected to, in the “altar-wise” position, was the Priest’s being placed at the furthest end of the chancel, close to the East wall, and out of the hearing of the congregation,—for this point the Injunction specially refers to; it was an arrangement associated in their minds with the “solitary masses” of the priest, so unlike the act of Communion, now happily restored, of the congregation communicating with the Priest. But the position of the Table itself, in regard to its longer and shorter sides, was less important when there was nothing, either in the shape of the Table or in its position—I mean, in other words, its place—in the chancel to suggest, in any painful or dangerous way, the idea of Romish masses.

It was a far wider and deeper controversy that was in hand. The Puritans’ feeling is plainly and graphically set before us by Cartwright, as referred to by Hooker.¹ “There is a third fault,” says T. C. (lib. i. p. 134), “which likewise appeareth almost in the whole body of this service and liturgy of England; and that is that the profit which might have come by it unto the people is not reaped; whereof the cause is, for that he which readeth is in some places not heard, and in the most places not understood of the people, through the *distance of place* between the people and the minister, so that a great part of the people cannot tell whether he hath cursed them or blessed them, whether he hath read in Latin or in English; all the which riseth upon the words of the Book of Service, which are that the minister should stand ‘in the accustomed place.’ For thereupon the minister in saying morning and evening prayer sitteth in the chancel with his back to the people, as though he had some secret talk with God, which the people might not hear. And hereupon it is likewise, that after morning prayer, for saying another number of prayers he *climbeth up to the further end of the chancel, and runneth as far from the people as the wall will let him*, as though there were some variance between the people and the minister, or as though he were afraid of some infection of plague. And indeed it reneweth the memory of the

¹ *Ecclesiastical Polity*, v. 30. 4.

Levitical priesthood, which did withdraw himself from the people into the place called the holiest place, where he talked with God, and offered for the sins of the people.

“Likewise for marriage he cometh back again into the body of the church, and for baptism unto the church door. What comeliness, what decency, what edifying is this? Decency, I say, in running and trudging from place to place: edifying, in standing in that place, and after that sort, where he can worst be heard and understood. S. Luke sheweth that in the primitive Church both the prayers and preachings, and the whole exercise of religion, was done otherwise. For he sheweth how S. Peter, sitting amongst the rest, to the end he might be better heard, rose, and not that only, but that he stood in the midst of the people, that his voice might, as much as might be, come indifferently to all their ears; and so standing both prayed and preached. Now if it be said, for the chapters and litany there is commandment given that they should be read in the body of the Church, indeed it is true; and thereof is easily perceived this disorder, which is in saying the rest of the prayers partly *in the hither end*, and partly *in the further end of the chancel*. For seeing that those are read in the body of the Church, that the people may both hear and understand what is read; what should be the cause why the rest should be read further off? unless it be that either things are not to be heard of them, or at least not so necessary for them to be heard as the other, which are recited in the body or midst of the Church.”

The brevity of Hooker’s reply, it may in passing be well to observe, would perhaps surprise some persons in these days, who have Hooker’s name often on their lips. He speaks of the opponents as “finding great fault that we neither reform the thing against the which they have so long sithence given sentence, nor yet make answer unto that they bring, which is that S. Luke declaring, etc. . . . that the custom which we use is Levitical, absurd, and such as hindereth the understanding of the people; that if it be meet for the minister at some time to look towards the people, if the body of the Church be a fit place for some part of divine service, it must needs follow that *whensoever his face is turned any other way, or anything done any other where*, it hath absurdity. ‘All these reasons’ they say have been brought, and

hitherto were never answered ; besides a number of merriments and jests unanswered likewise, wherewith they have pleasantly moved much laughter at our manner of serving God. Such is their evil hap to play upon dull-spirited men. We are still persuaded, that a bare denial is answer sufficient to things which mere fancy objecteth ; and that the best apology to words of scorn and petulancy is Isaac's apology to his brother Ishmael, the apology which patience and silence maketh. Our answer, therefore, to their reasons is no ; to their scoffs nothing."

This passage of Hooker shows plainly enough what was the real point at issue between the Church party and the Puritans. The "altarwise" arrangement which they objected to was the position of the Table at "the further end of the Chancel," against the East wall. He further recognises the saying of the other prayers "in the hither end," still of the Chancel, not "in the body of the Church," like the lessons and litany. And Hooker's controversy derives illustration from a curious account given by Strype of the conflict in an Essex parish. The parish minister concerned was one Richard Kechyn ; and the parish was Stisted, one of the Archbishop's Peculiars in the deanery of Bocking. "The Dean of Bocking, who, I think, was Mr. Cole," says Strype, in his *Life of Parker* (i. 304), "having some jurisdiction over Kechyn and some other ministers thereabouts, had charged him and the rest *not to turn their faces to the high altar in service-saying* ; which was a new charge and not given before. . . . Upon this occasion, the said minister thought convenient to acquaint Pearson, the Archbishop's Almoner and Chaplain, with these things, to impart them to the Archbishop, that he might have his counsel and direction. He told the Almoner, in a letter to him, what his practice was ; that, though he turned his face upward"—that is, of course, eastward, towards the *upper* part of the Chancel—"as he had done hitherto, yet his Church was small, and his voice might be heard. The Litany he said in the body of the Church ; and when he said the service, he kept the chancel, and turned his face to the east ;" (the Archbishop, it appears, "upon his admission had charged him to follow the *orders and rules appointed and established by law*, and to make no variation, whatsoever others should or might do, or persuade him to the contrary") ; "and that he was not zealous

in setting forth predestination. And for these matters they were much offended with him. He beseeched the Almoner, therefore, to let him understand his Grace's mind in the opinions above rehearsed. . . . That he would do nothing against his lawful Ordinary's mind. . . . That in such cases he depended upon them that had authority to alter ceremonies; and not upon the new brethren that seemed and would be thought to have authority, but had none. Further that he would gladly learn what articles his Grace caused to be inquired of in his Visitation; because the Dean, their visitor, had every year a new scroll of articles. And this, of charging all men not to turn their faces to the high altar, was one; which he called a 'new charge.'"

This little piece of history throws light on the passage of Hooker, just quoted; and gives a good idea of the contrast and conflict, in those days, between the "conformable" and the "non-conformist" mind. Mr. Kechyn would entirely have agreed with Hooker's principles and practices. And these two passages may help to explain what seems somewhat difficult of interpretation in the Rubric respecting the position of the Holy Table. "The Table," it is ordered, "at the Communion-time having a fair white linen cloth upon it, shall stand in the Body of the Church, or in the Chancel *where Morning and Evening Prayer are appointed to be said.*" The Morning and Evening Prayer were appointed to be said in the Chancel; and this wording of the Rubric would seem to have been intended to harmonise usages and preferences at variance with each other having in view the convenience of the worshippers, and their more easy taking part in the Service, yet without upsetting the established order, for the Chancels to "remain as they have done in times past."

When the Puritans obtained their will, and triumphantly carried it out, in the sense of the Genevan Reformation, it was not a simple turning of the Communion Tables East and West, instead of North and South, that they desired and effected. In Hooker's parish of Bishopsbourne, when a Puritan got possession of his parsonage, "it was not long," says Izaak Walton, "before this intruding minister had made a party in and about the said parish, that were desirous to receive the Sacrament as

in Geneva: to which end the day was appointed for a select company, *and forms and stools set about the Altar or Communion-Table for them to sit and eat and drink.*" This was what was in view, in the Puritan objection to the "altar-wise" position; but, meanwhile, which point of the compass, or which direction in the Church the Table took, was with them a very subordinate matter. And indeed, as I conceive, it is an entire mistake to identify the Genevan doctrine and system with the lengthwise—or east and west—position of the Table. In the Church of the Walloon congregation in the crypt of Canterbury Cathedral, there is, to this day, the table at the West end of the church, with a bench all round it for the communicants to sit at; but the table stands *across* the church, north and south. In John à Lasco's order of service, the minister, if I mistake not, sat in the middle of the table, with the communicants on either hand, the table being placed across. And I believe this has been the usual arrangement in the places of worship of congregations following the Genevan rite, or other systems of a kindred character. The Communion pew, I believe, contained a table set across the building, not lengthwise between the seats.

Of the symbolical import, the natural fitness, of different positions and postures in Divine worship and the ministry of the Word and sacraments, as it was appointed in the truly Catholic-minded order of his mother, the Church of England, as distinguished from Papal and Puritan innovations, none had a deeper sense than the "judicious" Hooker.

"When we make profession of our faith," said he, "we stand; when we acknowledge our sins, or seek unto God for favour, we fall down: because the gesture of constancy becometh us best in the one, in the other the behaviour of humility. Some parts of our liturgy consist in the reading of the word of God and the proclaiming of his law, that the people may thereby learn what their duties are towards him; some consist in words of praise and thanksgiving, whereby we acknowledge unto God what his blessings are towards us; some are such as, albeit they serve to singular good purpose even when there is no Communion administered, being devised at first for that purpose, are at the Table of the Lord for that cause also commonly read; some are uttered as from the people, some as with them unto God, some as from God unto them, all as before his sight whom we fear,

and whose presence to attend with any the least unseemliness we would be surely as loth as they who most reprehend or deride that we do."

We find, at the same time, Hooker prefacing these words of Christian piety and Catholic wisdom with others not less pious or less wise, when he said, "The next question whereunto we are drawn is, whether it be a thing allowable or no that the minister should say service in the chancel, or turn his face at any time from the people, and before service ended remove from the place where it was begun. By those who trouble us with such doubts we would now willingly be resolved of a greater doubt; whether it be not a kind of taking God's name in vain to debase religion with such frivolous disputes, a sin to bestow time and labour upon them. Things of so mean regard and quality, although necessary to be ordered, are notwithstanding very unsavoury when they come to be disputed of: because disputation presupposeth some difficulty in the matter which is argued, whereas in things of this nature they must be either very simple or very froward who need to be taught by disputation what is meet"

"To let go this" kind of question "as a matter scarce worth the speaking of; whereas," said Hooker, "if fault be in these things anywhere justly found, law hath referred the whole disposition and redress thereof to the *Ordinary* of the place; they which elsewhere complain that disgrace and 'injury' is offered even unto the meanest parish minister, when the magistrate appointeth him what to wear, and leaveth not so small a matter as that to his own discretion, being presumed a man discreet and trusted with the care of the people's souls, do think the gravest prelates in the land no competent judges to discern and appoint *where* it is fitting for the minister to stand, or *which way* convenient to look praying. From their *Ordinary*, therefore, they appeal to themselves. . . ." It were well if the Puritans of Hooker's time had no followers now-a-days in this respect—an unapostolical "succession," if not of doctrine, at least of practice; reappearing sometimes amongst us in a garb which strangely resembles the mantle of their Puritan predecessors, though not always cut after the same precise shape, or reflecting exactly the same colour.

It may appear, perhaps, to the reader of these Notes, as well

as to the writer, that enough has now been said on the "altar-wise" and "tablewise" position; but so much elaborate argument has been grounded on the presumed state of the case and its important bearings, setting aside, to all intents and purposes, the present Rubric and its traditional—and, I must think, its natural and right—interpretation, that we are compelled to follow on the discussion from Hooker to the next generation.

Before, however, we take leave of the days of Hooker and the reign of Elizabeth, a few words must be said, in regard to the Cathedral of Canterbury, in explanation, if so be, of a usage which appears perhaps, at first sight, not easy of interpretation. It has been said, in reference to Queen Elizabeth's Injunction, that "the varieties of ritual to which it gave rise were even more salient than those which have disturbed public opinion in our own time. At one extremity stood the Queen's Chapel, in which there can be no doubt that the altar ever maintained its position at the east end of the building. Canterbury Cathedral came next, with a combination," so it is said, "nothing less than ludicrous of the higher and the Puritan ceremonials, as we find in a description in Strype's *Memorials of Parker*, of the state of things there at the commencement of 1565:

" 'The Common Prayer daily through the year, though there be no Communion, is sung at the Communion Table, standing *north* and *south*, where the high altar did stand. The Minister when there is no Communion, useth a surplice only, standing on the east side of the table with his face toward the people.

" 'The Holy Communion is ministered ordinarily the first Sunday of every month throughout the year. At which time the table is set *east* and *west*. The Priest which ministereth, the Presbyter and Gospeler, at that time wear copes.'

"Next came the churches," we are told, "in which attention was paid to the Injunction, but in which no vestment was used; and lastly those in which the Lord's Table was never placed altarwise. So matters dragged on through the reign of Elizabeth."

Antecedently, however, it would appear somewhat improbable, or at least extraordinary, that there should have been a "combination, nothing less than ludicrous," of the Puritan with the

higher Church ceremonial, in the metropolitical church of the province, at the very time when Archbishop Parker, having received the Queen's letters on which the book of Advertisements was founded, had entered vigorously upon the work of securing Church order and uniformity everywhere. The "description" which we find in Strype is, in truth, nothing less than the "certificate, official and formal, made to the Archbishop's Commissary" in answer to a letter from the Archbishop. "It was mentioned above," says Strype, "how that in January last, upon the Queen's letters to our Archbishop for establishing the uniformity, he had required of every Bishop a certificate to be sent him up concerning their respective Clergy's manners and behaviour, their doctrine, and conformity to the *rites and Ceremonies of the Church*. He also sent his letter to *his own cathedral church* for that purpose. And this was the certificate made to the Archbishop's Commissary thereupon.

"Christ's Church, Cant. The certificate of the Vice-Dean of the cathedral and metropolitical Church of Christ in Canterbury, and the Prebendaries of the same here present. After due consultation had upon the copy of a letter directed from the Most reverend Father in God, Matthew, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, unto you his Grace's Commissary, containing the Queen's Highness pleasure and commandment for special regard to be had to the Clergy, within the province for their conformity in doctrine, and *uniformity in rites and ceremonies of the Church*, and for their private manners, usages, and behaviour, according to the tenor of the said letters: we do make our Certificate for the state of our Church touching the premises in the manner and form following :

"First, we do certify that there is no doctrine taught, etc.

"The Common Prayer, etc., as above.

"The holy Communion is ministered, etc. (as above). And none are suffered then to tarry within that chancel but the Communicants.

"For the ministering of the Communion we use bread by the Queen's Highness Injunctions."

"Which was to resemble the singing-cakes, which served formerly for the use of private Masses," says the marginal note in Strype.

It would seem clear that everything in the Metropolitan Cathedral was, professedly and actually, according to the duly appointed order of the "higher ceremonial." The "second service," as it was afterwards called, appears to have been "sung" daily; only the Minister stood on the East side of the Table; meeting, so far, apparently the difficulty of being heard by the whole congregation in the long and large choir of the Cathedral; yet guilty therein of no "Puritan" usage of a table in the midst, but rather following, if anything, the primitive basilican arrangement which has of late been somewhat pressed upon us, and which is the usage of S. Peter's at Rome; the table standing north and south; not close to the eastern wall, indeed, but in the place "where the high altar stood." At the time of Communion, at the monthly celebration, there was, as it would appear, no bringing of the Table down, in conformity with Puritan practice: the Table was only turned east and west, the Priest, be it observed, standing in the accustomed place in regard to the Table, and on the North side, in conformity with the rubric. The Cathedral authorities were acting, apparently, on the liberty given by the Queen's Injunctions in regard to the placing of the Table, yet without moving it or bringing it down from the upper end of the chancel; the Celebrant also turning to the Table; and the communicants according to the rubric placed conveniently, and near at hand, so that the Minister so standing might be well heard. This, I apprehend, is the true interpretation of the usages reported in the Dean and Chapter's certificate. There is not the slightest reason to suppose that Parker had anything to correct therein, in regard to due order and uniformity. All was manifestly in conformity with the "higher ceremonial." The certificate went on to say,

"The Evening Prayer in the winter is between three and four; in summer between four and five of the clock in the afternoon. At which prayers Mr. Dean, when he is here, and every of the Prebendaries, are present every day once at the least, appareled, in the choir. And when they preach, with surplice and silk hoods.

"The preachers being at home, come to the Common Prayer on Sundays and holydays, wearing surplices and hoods."

And in like manner of "the Petty Canons, the Lay Clerks, and Choristers, wearing surplices in the choir daily," etc.

The certificate bears the signature of seven prebendaries, the last being "Andrew Peerson," the Archbishop's own Almoner and Chaplain, already named in the Stisted story. In the following year, the Archbishop himself visited Canterbury, at Whitsuntide, the Dean and Clerks administering the holy Communion on Whitsunday; on Trinity Sunday "the Archbishop himself administered the mystic bread unto the people." There was, therefore, really no combination of Puritan practice in the celebration at the Holy Table in the choir of Canterbury Cathedral; the foreign Protestants meanwhile, as has been already shown, setting *their* Table across, not lengthwise, in their church in the crypt. Thus much as regards the Metropolitan Cathedral. It is hardly just, or true, meanwhile, in regard to Archbishop Parker and Whitgift, to speak of matters as "dragging on through the reign of Elizabeth." The very next chapter—the third book—in Strype's *Life of Parker* begins thus: "The Archbishop was now arrived to the sixty-first year of his age; and all the remainder of his days from hence to his grave was imbittered by the labours and pains he had with such as would not comply with the established rites and orders of the Church."

Much, of course, depended upon the tendencies of the individual Primates and Bishops; Grindal would relax, where Whitgift again would be more strict. But what is important to observe is, that the disorder arose out of a misuse of the liberty which was given; there was no order of the Church, as seems now very commonly supposed, for a lengthwise position of the Table in the body of the Church. The Church's order was that if, for convenience sake, it were removed at the time of Communion, it should be carried back to its place. It would easily happen that idleness or carelessness would neglect this; and so there came to be too generally the practice which rested meanwhile upon no law or order of the Church. We find Bishop Middleton, of St. David's, in 1583, while he enjoins that, "for the better edifying and hearing of the people in the ordinary service, the Minister shall always stand, either in the body of the Church, or at the least in the lower end of the Chancel (where commonly the seat of the Minister is), with his face always turned down unto the people, and thence reverently, distinctly,

and with a loud voice, reading the said service," has, amidst all his anti-Romish cautions, another injunction ordering, "when there is a Communion to be ministered, that the Communion Table be placed as near unto the people as may be convenient, and when the ministration is done, remove it to the upper end of the said Chancel."

To proceed now with the history. The greatest stress has been laid by parties differing very much from each other, on the fact, or supposed fact, already referred to, that the Rubric contemplated, or applied to, a totally different state of things from that now existing, inasmuch as the Table stood, and was ordered to stand, lengthwise in the church, east and west. To one writer this appears to "make some slight alteration" of the Rubric necessary; others think it supersedes, or, in fact, nullifies practically, the mention of the *North-side*; so that the nearest approach to an observance of the Rubric now is to stand on the *West-side*! We find ourselves meanwhile, carried back into the midst of the controversy in the reign of Charles I. in regard to Altar and Table, "side" and "end." The history, stated as briefly as may be, of the paper controversy, is this. The Vicar of Grantham had set the Table in his church against the East wall. This produced a "Letter written to the Vicar of Gr. (*sic.*) against the placing of the Communion Table at the *East-end of the chancel.*" This, as has already been observed, was the gist of the question. The letter was anonymous, but was written by his Diocesan, Williams, Bishop of Lincoln, and Dean of Westminster. He began by telling the vicar, "When I spake with you last, I told you that the standing of the Communion Table was with me a thing so indifferent that, unless offence and umbrages were taken by the town against it, I should never move it, nor remove it." However, an alderman did complain; and thereupon the Bishop gave directions to the churchwardens. He commends the vicar, so far, that he "presidents" himself with the form in his Majesty's Chapels and the quires of Cathedral Churches; adding the qualification, "if your quire, as those others, could contain the whole congregation." Here, as before, we see that the *hearing* was a main point in view. "These things," says Bishop Williams, "I do allow and practise. But that you should be so violent and earnest for an altar at the upper end of the quire; that the Table ought to stand altarwise;

that the *fixing* thereof in the quire is canonical, and that it ought not to be removed to the body of the church; I conceive to be in you so many mistakings." First he speaks about Altar and Table; and then proceeds. "For the second point, that your Communion Table is to stand *Altar-wise*, if you mean *in that place of the chancel* where the *Altar* stood, I think somewhat may be said for that; because the Injunctions, 1559, did so place it; and I conceive it to be the most decent *situation*, when it is not used; and for use too, where the quire is mounted up by steps, and open, so that he that officiates may be seen and heard of all the congregation. Such an one, I hear, your chancel is not. But if you mean by *Altar-wise*, that the Table should stand *along close by the wall*, so as you be forced to officiate at one *end* thereof (as you may have observed in great men's chapels;) I do not believe that ever the Communion Tables were (otherwise than by casualty) so placed in country churches. For besides that the country people would suppose them dressers, rather than tables; and that Queen Elizabeth's Commissioners for causes Ecclesiastical directed that the Table should stand, not where the Altar, but where the *steps of the Altar* formerly stood (Orders, 1561); the Minister appointed to read the Communion . . . is directed to read the Commandments not at the *end* but at the North-side of the Table, which implies the end to be placed towards the East great window. (Rubric before the Communion.) . . . What you saw in chapels or Cathedral Churches is not the point in question; but how the Tables are appointed to be placed in parish Churches. In some of the chapels and Cathedrals, the altars may be still standing, for ought I know; or, to make use of their covers and ornaments, Tables may be placed in their room of the same length and fashion the altars were of. We know the altars stand still in Lutheran Churches . . . and it seems the Queen's Commissioners were content they should stand, as we may guess by the Injunctions, 1559. But how is this to be understood? The sacrifice of the altar abolished, these (call them what you will) are no more altars, but tables of stone or timber. . . . And so may well be used in kings' and bishops' houses, where there are no people so void of understanding as to be scandalised. For, upon the orders of breaking down altars, all Dioceses did agree upon receiving Tables, but not upon the fashion of some of the Tables. (Acts and Monu-

ments, p. 1212.) Besides that, in the Old Testament, one and the same thing is termed an altar and a table; an altar in respect of what is there offered unto God, or table in respect of what is there participated by men. So you have God's altar, the very same with God's table in Malachi i. 7. The place is worth the marking. . . .

"Lastly, that your Table should stand in the higher part of the Church, you have my assent already in opinion: but that it should be there fixed is so far from being canonical, that it is directly against the Canon. For what is the rubric of the Church but a Canon? And the rubric saith, it 'shall stand in the body of the Church, or of the Chancel where Morning prayer and Evening prayer be appointed to be said.' If therefore Morning prayer and Evening prayer be appointed to be read in the body of the Church (as in most country Churches it is), where shall the Table stand most canonically? And so is the Table made removable, when the Communion is to be celebrated, to such place, &c. (Injunctions, 1559.) And so saith the Canon in force. . . . (Can. 82.) . . . The sum of all is this:

"1. You may not erect an altar, where the Canons only admit a Communion Table.

"2. This Table must not stand *altarwise*, and you at the North *end* thereof, but *tablewise*, as you must officiate at the *North side* of the same.

"3. This Table ought to be laid up (decently covered) in the Chancel only, as I suppose, but ought not to be officiated upon, either in the first or second Service (as you distinguish), but in that place of the Church or Chancel where you may be seen and heard of all. Though peradventure you be with him in Tacitus, master of your own, yet are you not of other men's *ears*, and therefore your parishioners must be judges of your *audibleness* in this case.

"Whether side soever (you or your parish) shall yield to the other, in this needless controversy, shall remain, in my poor judgment, the more discreet, grave, and learned of the two. And by that time you have gained some more experience in the cure of souls, you shall find no such ceremony as Christian charity, which I recommend unto you, and am ever, etc."

This is the outline of Bishop Williams' Letter ; it is not very easy to describe its views and principles. There must be no "altar" erected ; yet "altar" and "table" were, in fact, perfectly reconcileable terms : the Table might stand against the East wall, if only it stood East and West ; for the North *end* must by no means be treated as the North *side* ; the Table might stand at the upper end of the Chancel, if the officiating minister could be seen there, and the Service be heard from thence ; the controversy ought to cease, and the side that yielded would be not only "the more discreet, and grave," but the more "learned, of the two."

The Bishop of Lincoln and Dean of Westminster, already holding the office of Lord Keeper, to which he had been appointed in 1621 (July 10), had been living in the atmosphere of the courts of law and special pleaders, rather than in that of the Episcopal administration of Church order. It is in the capacity of Lord Keeper, as has been well observed, "that he is known to us in his portraits, with his official hat on his head, and the Great Seal by his side ;"¹ and "the astonishment produced by this unwonted elevation—his own incredible labours to meet the exigencies of the office—must be left," says the Dean, "to his biographer." To the office of Lord Keeper was added in a few months (Nov. 16, 1621) that of Bishop of Lincoln, "the largest diocese in the land." "Nor did he only keep the bishoprick of Lincoln and the deanery of Westminster," says Heylyn, "but also a residentiary's place in the Church of Lincoln, the prebend of Asgarve (*sic*), and parsonage of Walgrave [in Northamptonshire] ; so that he was a whole diocese in himself, as being Parson, Prebend, Dignitary, Dean, and Bishop ; and all five in one." So that "in the eyes of his enemies," as has been said, "he was a kind of ecclesiastical monster." His Episcopal utterances were of a somewhat remarkable kind. We have seen what was his first semi-official, and at the same time anonymous, *Letter to the Vicar of Grantham*. This produced, some time afterwards (1636), from the cloisters of Westminster, from the pen of Peter Heylyn, *A Coal from the Altar, or, An Answer to a Letter not long since written to the*

¹ Dean STANLEY'S *Westminster Abbey*, p. 427.

Vicar of Grantham against the Placing of the Communion Table at the East-end of the Chancel; and now of late dispersed abroad to the disturbance of the Church. First sent by a judicious and learned Divine for the satisfaction of his private Friend, and by him commended to the Press for the benefit of others. It came out with the imprimatur of Dr. Samuel Baker, domestic chaplain to the Bishop of London, dated May 5, 1636. It was written, as Heylyn's son-in-law and biographer informs us, at the instigation of Dean (afterwards Bishop) Towers, of Peterborough, and "approved by the King, and by him given to the Bishop of London, to be licensed and published." It filled sixty-six pages, and treated Williams' arguments somewhat unsparingly. About the Altarwise position he says, "Quo teneam nodo! This is just fast and loose; and I know not what; the reconciliation of two contradictions. The Queen's Injunctions," Heylyn goes on to say, "were set out for the reiglement and direction of all the Churches in this kingdom. . . . If in the place where the altar stood, then certainly it must stand along close by the wall, because the altars always stood so; and that as well in country churches as in great men's chapels, all being equally regarded in the same Injunctions. . . . Whereas in case the Table were to stand with one end toward the East great window . . . it could not possibly stand in the place where the altar did, as the Injunctions have appointed." (Laud, whose chaplain and friend Heylyn was, it may be observed, used the same argument: to set the Table east and west, he said, "had been *across* the place where the altar stood, and not *in* it.") "And would the people, Heylyn goes on to ask, "take the Table, if placed altarwise, to be a 'dresser,' not a Table? I now perceive," he says, "from whom Mr. Prynne borrowed so unmannerly and profane a phrase. . . . Just in that scornful sort, Doctor Weston, the *then Dean of Westminster*, did in a conference with Bishop Latimer call the Communion Tables . . . by the name of oyster boards. . . . The like did Doctor White, the *then Bishop of Lincoln*, in a conference with Bishop Ridley." "A slovenly and scornful term, as before was said, and such as doth deserve no other answer than what the marginal notes in the Acts and Monuments give in the one place to the Dean of Westminster, viz. 'The blasphemous mouth of Doctor Weston, calling the

Lord's Table an oyster board,' (page 85), or what they give in the other place to the Bishop of Lincoln; viz. 'Bishop White blasphemously called the Board of the Lord's Supper an oyster table' (page 497). I would there were no worse notes in the Acts and Monuments." Heylyn, no doubt, with no small satisfaction, exhibited these names to the anonymous letter writer.

The argument about North-side and North-end he fully answers, and goes through the letter to the Vicar of Grantham; adding the Order in Council (Nov. 3, 1633) in the case of S. Gregory's Church (near S. Paul's), which, he shows, simply sanctioned the action of the Ordinary; pronouncing, as it did, that "for so much as concerns the liberty given by the said Common Book or Canon, for placing the Communion Table in any Church or Chapel with most conveniency, that liberty is not so to be understood as if it were ever left to the discretion of the parish, much less to the particular fancy of any humorous person, but to the judgment of the Ordinary, to whose place and function it doth properly belong, to give direction on that point, both of the thing itself, and for the time and how long, as he may find cause." Subjoined was *A Copy of the Letter written to the Vicar of Grantham.*

This letter of Heylyn's produced in the year following, from Bishop Williams' pen, a volume of two hundred and forty pages—his biographer, Hacket, calls it "a little tractate"—*The Holy Table, Name and Thing, etc., written long ago by a Minister in Lincolnshire, in answer to D. Coal, a judicious Divine of Q. Mary's days. . . . Printed for the Diocese of Lincoln, 1637.* And the book appeared with the following extraordinary imprimatur: "I have read and thoroughly perused a book called *The Holy Table, Name and Thing, etc.*, written by some Minister of this Diocese; and do conceive it to be most orthodox in doctrine, and consonant in discipline, to the Church of England; and to set forth the King's powers and rights, in matters ecclesiastical, truly and judiciously; and very fit to be printed; and do allow and approve of the same treatise to be printed and published in any place or places where as Ordinary I am enabled and licensed so to do. And in writing hereof I have subscribed my name, the last day of November, Jo. Lincoln, Deane of Westminster."

The imaginary D. Coal, the “judicious Divine of Q. Mary’s days,” it will be borne in mind, was intended to call up the memory of the Dr. Cole who preached the Sermon at Cranmer’s death, and held divers offices, and took a prominent part on the Papist side, through Queen Mary’s reign, and in the first days of Elizabeth. Williams’ biographer, Bishop Hacket, has at great length “cleared the rise of the controversy” which he lamented. “This the Colleges of Rome would have,” he says, —fully alive as he was to all that might be felt and pleaded on either side of the controversy,—“to see us warm in petty wranglings, and remiss in great causes. . . . Woe be to the authors of such Cadmæan wars. . . . A most unnecessary gap made in the vineyard, through which both the wild boar, our foreign enemy, and the little foxes at home may enter in to spoil the grapes. Plutarch¹ tells me of a contention between the Osyndrites and Cynopolites, who went to war for the killing of a fish, which one of the factions accounted to be a sacred creature; and when they were weakened with slaughter on both sides . . . in fine, the Romans overrun them, and made them their slaves. Let the story be to them that hates (*qu. hate*) us, and the interpretation fall upon our enemies.”

Some twenty pages of his book Bishop Williams occupies with argumentation on the North side and North end question, of which this may serve as a sufficient specimen: “A *side* in the English tongue is a *long length* (as the side of a man, from whence the word is derived, is the *longest length* of a man), and the two sides of a long square, the two long lengths of that square; which to the *world’s end* will never be proved to be that *square’s end*.”

“No sooner the King heard of this new book, but he sent a command to Dr. Heylyn to write a speedy answer to it, and not in the least to spare the Bishop.” “And he obeyed the royal command, in the space of seven weeks presenting it ready printed, . . . and called it *Antidotum Lincolnense*.” It appeared with his name, as Chaplain in Ordinary to his Majesty, to whom it was dedicated, with a “Preface to the grave, learned, and religious Clergy of the Diocese of Lincoln,” dated “West-

¹ Lib. *De Is. et Osyr.*

minster, May 10, 1637." "And though the Bishop's book was (from the dissatisfaction of the times, the subject-matter of the book itself, and the religious esteem of the author, who was held in high veneration) looked upon as unanswerable, and sold for no less than 4s., yet upon the coming out of the answer, it was brought to less than one."

Bishop Hacket, Archbishop Williams' faithful friend and biographer, has brought forward all that wit, or charity, or ingenuity could suggest in behalf of his patron's anonymous publications; but ends it by saying, "So far, if not too far, upon the Bishop's Letter and his book *The Holy Table*, . . . and I will listen to Sidonius¹: 'Post mortem non opuscula, sed opera pensanda.' We are to consider after a good man's death his works of bounty and mercy, rather than his books of controversy."² He repeats the quotation in the last page of the *Life* (p. 230). He had told us that, when the *Antidotum* appeared, the Bishop, he knew, "was making his notes ready to vindicate his book, and was resolved, as the Italian proverb runs, to give his adversary cake for bread." But "he was prevented by his cause in Star Chamber, which was brought to hearing in the same month that the *Antidotum* came abroad. His imprisonment lasted three years (1637-1640). Soon after followed his second committal to the Tower (1641), with twelve other Bishops, on their "protest against their violent exclusion from the House of Lords," which he had drawn up hastily, "in a state of fury" at the insults of the mob. He "had just received from the King the prize so long coveted, but now too late for enjoyment, of the see of York. . . . The Chapter Book" at Westminster "contains only two signatures of Williams as Archbishop of York: one immediately before his imprisonment, Dec. 21, 1641; one immediately after his release, May 18, 1642. This must have been his last appearance, in the scene of so many interests and so many conflicts, in Westminster. He left the capital to follow the King to York, and never returned."³

He survived not many months the beheading of the King, of whose "conscience" it had once been his office to be the "keeper;" and who, in the case of Lord Strafford, had sad

¹ *Lib.* viii. c. i. ² *Life*, p. 110. ³ STANLEY'S *Westminster*, p. 481.

experience of what Clarendon calls "the argumentation of that unhappy casuist, who truly it may be did believe himself," in the refined distinctions which he drew between the king's "public" and "private conscience;" telling him "it would be very strange if his conscience should prefer to surrender the right of one single private person, how innocent soever, before all those other lives and the preservation of his kingdom."¹ Williams had already seen the execution of the brother Archbishop, to whom he had been so vehemently opposed. He had lived also to see the carrying out, in Westminster Abbey, of the full results of that which alone—as has already been said—would satisfy the Puritan faction, to whom he had lent the support of his name and dignity, when they talked of the "tablewise" position. "In July 1643," says Dean Stanley, "took place the only actual desecration to which the Abbey was exposed." But, it must be observed, it was a desecration tolerably complete. "It was believed in Royalist circles," says the Dean—and I must say I think it was believed on good grounds—"that soldiers were quartered in the Abbey"—"Some soldiers," says the Dean, in a note, "of Washborne and Cawood's companies, perhaps because there were no houses in Westminster,"²—who burnt the altar-rails, *sate on benches round the Communion Table*, eating, drinking, smoking, and singing; destroyed the organ, and pawned the pipes for ale in the alehouses; played at hare and hounds in the Church, the hares being the soldiers dressed up in the surplices of the Choir; and turned the Chapels and High Altar to the commonest and basest uses."³

We learn that "whilst the monuments and the fabric received but little injury, the *ornaments* of the Church suffered materially. The Altar, *if indeed it ever had been since the Reformation at the east end of the Choir*, had in Williams' time been brought into the centre of the Church for the Communion of the House of Commons." I confess to some surprise at this *sweeping* doubt

¹ *History of the Rebellion*, book iv.

² It does not appear from whom this is quoted. It suggests irresistibly the questions—"What? have ye *not* houses to eat and to drink in? Or despise ye the Church of God . . .?"

³ "*Crull*, vol. ii. App. ii. p. 14; *Mercurius Rusticus*, February 1643, p. 153."

on the part of the Dean.¹ If the Abbey is a Royal Peculiar, Queen Elizabeth would certainly not have allowed of any Puritan arrangement there. Further than this, it was admitted on all hands that the "altarwise" position was all but the universal practice in Cathedrals and Royal chapels, etc.; and not only so, but what gave especial offence to Heylyn in Williams' proceedings was, that all the while "the Communion Table was placed altarwise, not only in the cathedral church of Lincoln, whereof he was Bishop," but also "*in the Collegiate church of Westminster, of which he was Dean.*" Andrewes, it will be borne in mind, had been Dean from 1601–1605; and was succeeded by Neale, who was Dean for another five years; and he by Montaigne, for seven years more; and Montaigne by Tounson—all of the same school of religious opinion and ecclesiastical principles. It cannot be doubted that it was "in Williams' time," and in his time alone, "that the Table had been brought into the centre of the Church, for the Communion of the House of Commons." The House of Commons had put forth an order, without the concurrence of the Lords (Sept. 8, 1641), that the Tables should be removed into the body of the Church, and that the rails should be taken away." "The Commons had for some time before communicated in the middle of the church at Westminster Abbey, with the willing permission of the Dean, Bishop Williams."²

Heylyn himself, surviving the Troubles, was at hand in

¹ There is another story in regard to the Abbey which, we are told, "Mr. Forster (*Statesmen*, vol. i.) doubts." "Henry Marten,"—such was the story,—"with the malicious humour for which he was noted,"—Anthony Wood had said, "with a scorn greater than his lusts and the rest of his vices,"—"broke open the huge iron chest in the ancient Chapel of the Treasury, and dragged out the crown, sceptre, sword, and robes, consecrated by the use of six hundred years; and put them on George Wither the poet, 'who did first trail about the town with a stately garb, and afterwards, with a thousand apish and ridiculous actions, exposed those sacred ornaments to contempt and laughter.'" (Wood's *Ath.*) It certainly appears a strange story; but not so incredible, when we restore the original reading in Anthony Wood, which is, that George Wither "did first *march* about the *room* with a stately garb," etc. With this modification, I confess I see no reason to doubt the story.

² See *Nelson*, i. 563.

his prebend at Westminster, when, in 1661, that "Convocation was called by his Majesty's writ," which he had been a prime agent in bringing about, according to the constitutional practice, which he strongly urged; "and during the time of their sitting (while the Doctor lived) he seldom was without visitors from them, who constantly upon occasion came to him for his advice and direction in matters relating to the Church, because he had himself been an ancient clerk in the old convocations. I happened to be there," says his son-in-law, Dr. Barnard, "when the good Bishop of Durham, Dr. Cosins, came to see him." And among the Bishops there was Hacket also, now promoted to the see of Lichfield; who, with all his regard for his old master, Archbishop Williams, did not, as we have seen, much differ from Archbishop Laud's old chaplain, Heylyn, in regard to the former points of dispute, and the importance to be attached to them.

The canon, meanwhile, which, in 1641, had lately passed in that elder Convocation, which met and continued its sessions under circumstances so unfortunate, yet in this respect at least with excellent design, will illustrate the history as it has now been traced, and also, by anticipation (it may be added), the latest action of Convocation in the matter. The "declaration"—forming canon 7, of 1640,—“concerning some rites and ceremonies,” began thus:

“Because it is generally to be wished that unity of faith were accompanied with uniformity of practice in the outward worship and service of God; chiefly for the avoiding of groundless suspicions of those who are weak, and the malicious aspersions of the professed enemies of our religion; the one fearing the innovations, the other flattering themselves with the vain hope of our backsliding unto their popish superstition, by reason of the situation of the Communion table, and the approaches thereunto, the Synod declareth as followeth:

“That the standing of the Communion Table sideways under the east window of every chancel or chapel, is in its own nature indifferent, neither commanded nor condemned by the Word of God, either expressly or by immediate deduction, and therefore that no religion is to be placed therein, or scruple to be made thereon. And albeit at the time of reforming this Church from

that gross superstition of popery, it was carefully provided that all means should be used to root out of the minds of the people both the inclination thereto and memory thereof; especially of the idolatry committed in the mass, for which cause all popish altars were demolished: yet notwithstanding it was then ordered by the Injunctions of Queen Elizabeth of blessed memory, that the Holy Tables should stand in the place where the altars stood, and accordingly have been continued in the royal chapels of three famous and pious princes, and in most cathedral and some parochial churches; which doth sufficiently acquit the manner of placing the said Tables from any illegality, or just suspicion of popish superstition or innovation. And therefore we judge it fit and convenient that all churches and chapels do conform themselves in this particular to the example of the cathedrals or mother churches, saving always the general liberty left to the bishop by the law, during the time of administration of the Holy Communion. And we declare that this situation of the Holy Table doth not imply that it is, or ought to be esteemed, a true and proper altar, where Christ is again really sacrificed; but it is, and may be called, an altar by us, in that sense in which the primitive Church called it an altar, and in no other."

The canon goes on to provide for the decent railing in of Communion Tables in all chancels or chapels, "to preserve them from such, or worse, profanations" as experience had shown they were exposed to from the irreverent behaviour of many people in many places; "some leaning, others casting their hats, and some sitting upon, some standing, and others sitting under the Communion Table in time of Divine Service. It goes on further to declare that "because the administration of holy things is to be performed with all possible decency and reverence, therefore" the synod judged it "fit and convenient, according to the word of the Service Book established by Act of Parliament, 'Draw near,' etc., that all communicants, with all possible reverence, shall draw near and approach to the holy table, there to receive the divine mysteries, which have heretofore in some places been unfitly carried up and down by the minister; unless it shall be otherwise appointed in respect of the incapacity of the place, or other inconvenience, by the bishop

himself in his jurisdiction, and other ordinaries respectively in theirs."

It may be observed, in regard to this canon, that it gives us a summary view, in the retrospect, of the whole case in regard to the Church's order under the existing Rubric. Altars had been taken away, under the conviction that the errors in doctrine and practice which had been connected with them could not be effectually removed, and the Holy Communion, according to Christ's ordinance, be restored, while they existed; and therefore Tables were to be put in their place. These were moveable, and the power of moving them seemed necessary in some cases, arranged as the churches and chancels so often were; and this was to be decided in each case by the bishop, as became an Episcopal Church. There had been made thereby, doubtless, a great opening for individual opinion and various practice; but however general a departure from what the Church desired had taken place in parish churches, still there had been no order of the Church, as seems now-a-days to be very commonly supposed, *requiring* a change of place, still less "insisting on" a position lengthwise. The canon, meanwhile, carefully avoided any mention of an "altarwise" or "tablewise" position; it recognised a "sideway" position, obviously north and south, under the East window; it deprecated a party-spirited interpretation of any position of the Holy Table, or any undue attaching a doctrinal importance to it, or any use of the name "altar" save in the sense of the primitive Church. What was assuredly true and wise and charitable then, and in the interests of peace,—though "the son of peace" was seldom to be found in the house at that disastrous period,—in regard to the position of the Holy Table, is not less true and wise and charitable now, in regard to that which is so closely connected with it, the question of the position of the Minister. In the resolutions of the synod of 1640, had the times been less "out of joint," there were the principles of unity for those who would "love the truth and peace;" prospects of peace for the Church, as I would say, in the Prayer Book and its rules, not misused in the liberty they gave, under the lawful authority and fatherly discretion of the Church's appointed rulers.

I could wish that we might have passed on at once to the conclusion of this historical summary, under the aspects of the present time, having already considered the only change, made in the Rubric at the last Review, affecting the question before us, but that there has been started lately a theory taking an entirely novel view of what happened then. Singularly at variance with all established notions in regard to the character of that Review, it has been supposed that the principles of Church order, after a hard conflict, underwent a signal defeat; and that the results of the triumph of Puritanism are to be traced in the existence of our present Rubric, then unaltered, with inextricable difficulties apparently arising out of it.

We have the somewhat remarkable circumstance, meanwhile, in the present condition of things, that among those who, it might have been supposed, would be on the side of Laud and Heylyn and Cosin, are found resolute supporters of the arguments of Williams, and Peter Smart of Durham. While on the one side, then, some would set aside the present Rubric as, on their hypothesis, inapplicable, their opponents have been found holding out something like a threat, that, if any decision were given in such a sense, they would take in hand to enforce the present Rubric, as they interpret it, and insist on placing the Lord's Table lengthwise in the body of the Church. It becomes necessary, therefore—as briefly as may be—to examine the grounds of this theory as to the proceedings at the last Review.

It is pronounced very positively that our altars now “have no ‘North side’ :” that “they have a North and South end, and an East and West side” : that “a literal obedience to the Rubric is therefore impossible. To reply to this objection by quoting the definition of a parallelogram”—as Laud and Heylyn did against their antagonists—it is pronounced, “is mere trifling.” For that “we may be sure that the compilers of the Prayer Book of 1552, when they prescribed the North side, were thinking in the ordinary language of the day, and not in the language of mathematical definitions; and” that “the ordinary language of their day, as of our own, recognises two sides

and two ends in an oblong table." Upon which it may be sufficient to observe, that whereas, by the Prayer Book of 1549, it had been ordered that the Priest should be "standing humbly afore the midst of the altar," in other words, in *front* of the altar, by the Prayer Book of 1552 he was ordered to be standing at the *side*—and that side the North side of the Table. "The ordinary language of the day" would make this perfectly intelligible, whatever were the exact shape of the table.

"The state of the case as regards the revisionists of 1662," we are told now, by another contributor to the "mass of controversial literature," with undoubting positiveness of assertion, "was as follows: They were quite clear, as their answer to the Puritans shows, that the right position for the altar was at the East end of the church, and that the Priest ought to be in front of it. But on this question, as on vestments, Puritanism was then in possession. The altars were all table-wise in the body of the church, and their restoration to the ancient position would be a work of time. The Bishops, therefore, left the 'North-side' Rubric untouched, but they made alterations in the Rubrics where they implied the eastward position of altar and Priest. While the altars were in the body of the church, the North side was still the front; and the Bishops, being sensible men, probably thought that, when the front was turned to the West instead of to the North, the common sense of the Priest would teach him to follow the front, instead of placing himself at the end—a position which is extremely inconvenient, and which has nothing to recommend it," so we are told, "but an unreasoning prejudice." In answer to this, it is scarcely necessary to repeat that the Bishops' answer to the Puritans does not prove the eastward position of the Priest at the Lord's Table; that the Bishops, undoubtedly, contemplated and provided for a general adoption of the altarwise position, i. e. against the East wall; and that the common sense, according to what is plainly to be proved was their view of the matter, would direct the Priest to take his place at the North side, or end (if anyone chose to call it so); the "front" of the table being that to which the congregation looked, the back the East wall, and two sides, of the table as of the Chancel, the North and the South. And it is equally clear that they thought they were specially consulting "con-

venience" in the arrangements they were making by these Rubrics.

But it is re-asserted very confidently, that "the North-side cannot be the North-end, for this obvious reason, that the sides and the ends of such a Table are two entirely different things. It is true"—thus much is admitted—"that if one were speaking, mathematically, of a parallelogram, one might say that it had four sides. But speaking practically, and in ordinary language, of an oblong table, we can only say that it has two sides, with two ends." And further, it is argued that when, in 1552, the Table was ordered to stand, in Communion time, "in such place . . . as the people might best hear," "we know from contemporary practice, that this place was supposed to be right down among the congregation, . . . where, *of course*, it could only stand with its two ends East and West, and with its sides North and South." We are told, "there can be no doubt that the Revisers of 1552 intended by these alterations to symbolise a complete and radical change in the very substance and meaning of the Communion Service itself. . . . It was scarcely to be wondered at, therefore, that those who held higher views on this subject should do their utmost to get this order of things reversed. And this was attempted," it is said, "by means of Royal and Episcopal Injunctions, and by such devices as inclosing the Holy Table with rails." "There can be little doubt," so it is represented, "that the justice and force of the distinction," which the Puritans had pressed, between the sides and the ends of the Table, "was felt by the High Church party themselves. For we have proof," it is said, "that they did their best to obviate its practical effect by means of new and amended Rubrics." First, we are reminded, there was "the Scottish Prayer Book (1637), probably at the instigation of Archbishop Laud, having manifestly this object in view. It enjoins that 'the Holy Table . . . shall stand at the uppermost part of the Chancel or Church; where the Presbyter, standing at the *North-side or end* thereof, shall say,' etc. And then afterwards," it is said, "we find an unsuccessful attempt made, at the last Revision of the Prayer Book (1662), to get the corresponding rubric of our own Communion Service altered in the same sense. The history of this attempt," we are told, "is exceedingly

curious and interesting. The evidences of it," it would seem, "are to be found in that copy of the Prayer Book of 1604 (printed in 1636) which was used by the Revisers of 1662, as the basis of their revision. . . . In that Prayer Book are to be found, in the margin, opposite the old rubric on the position of the Altar 'at Communion-time,' the following words, in MS., by way of suggestion for a new rubric:

" 'The Holy Table . . . shall stand in the most convenient place in the upper end of the Chancel (or of the body of the Church where there is no Chancel).'

"But a pen was afterwards drawn through these words, as they do not seem"—so it is supposed—"to have met with the approval of Convocation, and the old rubric was allowed to stand as it was before.

"But further," it is added, "in the text of another part of the same rubric, there is a very significant erasure and MS. correction, which, no doubt," so we are told, "contemplated the same object, and which had also to be cancelled for the same reason. In the clause 'standing at the North-side of the Table,' the word 'side' is erased with the pen, and the word 'end' is written above it. But this change also seems to have been disapproved of; as we find the word 'end' is afterwards cancelled, and the word 'side' reinserted in MS. over it." Still further, it appears that "in Bishop Cosin's own annotated Prayer Book (preserved at Durham), which is, no doubt, the original source of the MS. corrections and suggestions contained in the Prayer Book here referred to, there is a proposed emendation, which is even more significant than the one just described. After having erased the word 'side,' and substituted 'end,' the Bishop altered it afterwards to 'side or end;' and then, ultimately, both emendations had to give place to the original word 'side,' as Convocation would not agree"—so it is asserted—"to any alteration whatever in the Rubric.

"There can be little doubt," thus we are assured, "that the chief opposition to all these suggested alterations arose from the Puritan party; though I can quite imagine," says the writer, "that it may not have been altogether discouraged by the more decided members of the opposite school. But at all events"—this is the conclusion arrived at—"the whole proceeding serves

to show very clearly the importance, as well as the reality, which was attached by both parties to the distinction between the sides and the ends of the Holy Table. And it seems, moreover," as it is supposed, "to show, quite as clearly, that, while the High Church party felt most keenly and painfully the force of this distinction, and did their utmost, at the Revision of 1662, to get rid of its practical and legal effect, yet they found themselves, after all, utterly unable to do so, either by securing the substitution of 'end' for 'side,' or even by obtaining the admission of 'end' as an alternative with 'side.' And hence"—so we are told, in somewhat solemn language—"it has come to pass, that we have now the phrase 'North-side' standing in our authorised Communion Service, with this particular meaning stamped upon it, and stamped on it, too, all the more definitely and indelibly from the very efforts that were so strenuously made to obviate it."

It is certainly "an exceedingly curious and interesting" history that is thus made out. But, unfortunately, it is nothing but imagination throughout. There was no such conflict in Convocation, no such opposition, no such Puritan party there. All was settled, in Committee, at Ely House, among the Bishops. They had Bishop Cosin there, and Sancroft as their Secretary, with all his carefully prepared notes, assisting Cosin and Wren, and other chief Bishops. Bishop Cosin's suggestions were, for the most part, adopted, save where they would have introduced considerable change; and there "my Lords the Bishops at Elie House ordered all in the old method." Cosin had not forgotten his former troubles, nor the old controversy between Williams and Heylyn, and would shut the door on any such like arguments and objections; he would, probably enough, propose to change "side" into "end," or to use "side or end," as in the Scottish Book, as terms indifferent; and finally might think, or find his brother Bishops thought, that the best course was to leave the old word unaltered.

In one of the recent contributions to the "mass of controversial literature" on this subject (July 12), it is said: "The position of the priest at this moment of the service, in reference to the congregation, depends on the previous placing of the Holy Table. Now for this previous placing of the table,"

the writer goes on to say, "we have most distinct rules. Both the Eighty-second Canon and the last of the rubrics which precede the beginning of the Service, draw a sharp distinction between 'the Communion time' and other times, and they direct that 'at the Communion time' the table is to be so placed, either in the body of the Church or in the Chancel, as to be in convenient contiguity with the congregation. This Canon and the rubric," we are told, "are not now observed; and it is almost entirely because of this desuetude that 'orientation' has a plausible case. The argument involved in this statement," thus the writer proceeds, "is made much stronger (and here historical evidence begins to be singularly important) by the fact that, just before 1662, which year must of necessity be our chronological starting-point, attempts were made (unsuccessfully) to procure official sanction for the permanent placing of the table against the East wall at the upper end of the Chancel. An attempt of this kind, vigorously made and decisively defeated, becomes a strong testimony to the mind of the Church in favour of the rule that remains"—a "clear and well-attested rule," as it is described, "for the placing of the Table."

This argument rests on the presumed correctness of the history just now referred to, and falls through, if that presumed history have no warrant in fact. It is to be observed, that neither the Eighty-second Canon, nor the fourth rubric of the Communion office, says anything about "convenient contiguity with the congregation." The rubric simply provides, that the Table at the Communion-time "shall stand in the body of the Church or the Chancel," not requiring it to stand otherwise, in regard to East and West, North and South, than it stood at all other times. It made provision, in fact, for the case of deep chancels, or chancels closely shut in, and not large enough to admit of "the Communicants being conveniently placed therein for the receiving of the holy Sacrament," in conformity with another rubric and with the ordinary practice then; it enabled the communicants to "draw near," so meeting the difficulty which arose out of the construction of many of our old Churches, and securing more effectually the observance of the order that "the Chancels shall remain as they have done in times past." The Canon, meanwhile, presumes the Table to be in the accustomed

place, "and so stand," as it is expressed, "saving when the said Holy Communion is to be administered. At which time," according to words already quoted, but which it is necessary here to recall to mind, "the same shall be placed in so good sort within the Church or Chancel"—it is not defined which; it is left to be decided by the circumstances of the case—"as thereby the Minister may be more conveniently heard of the Communicants in his prayer and ministration, and the Communicants also more conveniently and in more number communicate with the Priest: and that the Ten Commandments be set upon the East end of every Church and Chapel, where the people may best see and read the same." Neither of the Canon nor of the rubric, as it appears to me, can it be said that they "are not now observed." Churches built since the dates of the Canon and rubric have very commonly been built with short chancels, or simple apses, or no chancels at all. But the rubric and Canon say nothing about "contiguity with the congregation;" and there may be cases, such as Canterbury Cathedral, where the more remote position of the Communion Table for the last half century is found, as matter of fact, more favourable for hearing than the nearer place in which it formerly stood. And it must be repeated that there is no such sharp distinction, in rubric or Canon, as *requires* necessarily a moving of the table, the paramount objects of convenient order and of good hearing being secured. Nothing, in the nature of a "rule" of the Church required a change in the accustomed *position* of the Table, in regard to North and South.

We have already considered fully Bishop Cosin's Rubric, by the light of other Rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer, or Rubrics of his own suggestion, or Bishop Wren's. We must, however, before we take leave of him, notice what has been justly called "a document of much interest," viz. "the Order which Bishop Cosin used for the Consecration of Churches and churchyards."¹ And it is formally entitled, "The Form and Order of Direction or Consecration of Churches and Chapels, together with the Churchyards or places of Burials, according

¹ *Correspondence*, vol. ii. p. xiv.

to the Use of the Church of England." "This form of prayer, as we learn from a note in Archdeacon Basire's hand, was used by Bishop Cosin at the Consecration of Christ Church, Tynemouth, on Sunday, the 5th July, 1668." It appears further, that "on the 22nd of March, 166 $\frac{1}{2}$ (the seventy-first Session of Convocation), there was a consultation about a Form of Consecration of Parish Churches and Chapels, which was committed to the sole care of Bishop Cosin." This is the more remarkable, as it was the *Bishop of Durham*, in the province of York, to whom the Bishop of London, presiding in the Convocation of Canterbury, by and with the *consensus* of his brethren, thus committed the matter. It has been justly presumed that "the form which he used in his own diocese was probably identical with that which he prepared for general adoption." "Some of the rubrical directions" in this Service, it has been observed, "are worthy of remark, as illustrating Bishop Cosin's practice as regards ritual. It is clear that a celebration of the Holy Communion was intended to be an inseparable adjunct of the Service; and the rubric at the commencement of that office contains very specific directions as to the *position* of those who were engaged in the celebration. 'Then shall the Bishop ascend towards the Table of the Lord, and there kneel down at his falstoole *before it*, his Chaplains following him, and placing themselves *at each end of the Table*, where he that is at the North shall begin the Communion Service,' &c. Yet from a subsequent rubric," it has been thought, "we may certainly assume that the Bishop was the celebrant; for it provides that he shall reverently offer upon the Lord's Table the Deed, or Act of Consecration, the Bread and Wine, and his own alms and oblations." It is asked then, "Was the position occupied by the Bishop at the commencement of the Service maintained throughout?" And the reply given is, "It can scarcely be an unfair inference that it was so." But this inference will be found, I think, to have no good grounds.

The office which the Bishop was to fulfil is most clearly marked, viz. that of making the solemn offering and dedication of the building to the service of God; but he was, I think, as clearly *not* regarded as the celebrant in the administration of the Holy Communion.

For the Bishop it was ordered, in the first place, as follows :

“Kneeling down *in the midst of the Church* (or Chapel) *the place being duly prepared for him*, he shall say,

“I will call unto the most high God : even the God which shall perform the work which I have in hand.

“Hear the voice of thy servant, O Lord, when I hold up my hands towards thy mercy’s seat of thy temple.”

This the Bishop would say, of course, kneeling, with his face towards the Chancel ; yet, let it be observed, placed so to be heard by all the congregation.

“Then shall he speak unto the Founder and the people present, and say, Let us offer up and dedicate this place unto God with the words and prayers which he most graciously accepted from King David and King Solomon,” etc.

This the Bishop would say, of course, turning to the people.

“Then, *turning* and kneeling down, he saith (1 Chron. xxix.) Blessed be thou,” etc.—a very full and long prayer.

“Then the Bishop standing up shall say, The Blessed and Glorious Trinity, . . . sanctify and bless this place, to the end whereunto we have ordained it,” etc. This he would say, no doubt, turning to the people, it being of the nature of a Blessing. “Then going to the Font,” etc.

“Then going up to the Chancel and the Table of the Lord, and reverently placing thereupon the plate prepared for the Holy Communion, then presented to him by the Founder, or Donor, he shall kneel down *before the Table* and say, Grant, O Lord,” etc.

There can be no doubt, after the evidence we have had, where it was the Bishop would kneel, viz. *in front* of the Table.

The prayer ought to be given in full, as expressing most distinctly the view taken of the Eucharistic offering in the Holy Communion, distinct, and clear from Romish corruption of the Catholic doctrine and rite, and reflecting faithfully the careful language and duly appointed order of the Church of England.

“Grant, O Lord, that this place may be hallowed, together with all things prepared in it for thy holy service ; and that thy faithful and devout people, approaching with pure hearts and clean minds unto this Holy Table, here to present and offer up themselves, their souls and bodies, as a reasonable, holy, and

lively sacrifice unto thee, together with their sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving for that blessed Sacrifice which thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ once offered upon the Cross for the sins of the whole world, may by the religious partaking of his most Holy Sacrament obtain remission of their sins, and all other benefits of his Passion, and be endued with thy grace and heavenly benediction, through the same Jesus Christ our Lord, who liveth and reigneth with thee, O Father, and thy Blessed Spirit, one God, world without end. *Amen.*"

"Then, returning into the body of the Church, he shall kneel down at his [? faldstool] and say,

"Grant, O blessed Lord, that this House, being now separated from all other common uses, and dedicated unto thee by our office and ministry, may be favourably accepted by thee as an humble oblation from our hands, through thy mercy," etc.

One of the petitions that follows is this :

"And when they shall make any offering unto thee, let their oblations and offerings come up as a memorial before thee, and be acceptable in thy sight, who hast said by thy holy Apostle, that with such sacrifices thou art well pleased. *Amen.*"

"Then shall the Bishop there, in the midst of the Church, place himself in his chair, being attended by the Founder on the right hand, and on the left by his Chancellor, Archdeacon, and Chaplains, and shall publish and read this Act of Dedication, fairly written, and sealed with his Episcopal seal :

"In Dei Nomine, Amen. Cum dilectus noster in Christo N." etc.

"Then shall the Bishop give order to his Chaplains, or other Ministers there present, to say the Morning Service," etc.

"Immediately after the Collect for the Day, this special Collect shall be added and said by the Bishop."

"Then shall one or both the Chaplains, or other Ministers then present, and duly habited, descend to say or sing the Litany in the midst of the Church or Chapel."

After the Litany stands the Rubric already given ; a Rubric which is in exact accordance with all others in its use of the words "*before*" the Table, and "*at each end of the Table*";

the words "end" or "side" being manifestly, in Bishop Cosin's view, equivalent and identical in meaning.

"Then shall the Bishop reverently offer upon the Lord's Table, first, the Act of consecrating the Church or Chapel, . . . then the Bread and Wine for the Communion, and then his own Alms and Oblations," etc.

"Then one of the Priests shall receive the Alms and Oblations.

"Then the chief Minister shall say,

"Blessed be thou, O Lord, for ever and ever; and now, O Lord, we thank thee, and praise thy glorious Name, [we] have seen with joy thy people which are here present and have offered all these things willingly unto thee.

"Then shall they go on in the Service of the Communion; and after the last Collect and immediately before the Benediction, these two Collects following shall be said by the Bishop.

"Blessed be thy Name, etc.

"Prevent us, O Lord, etc.

"Then the Bishop, rising up and turning himself towards the people, shall give the Benediction, and say,

"The peace of God," etc.

It is clear, I think, that the Bishop was *not*, according to this order of Service, the Celebrant: the part he takes is distinguished from that of the "chief Minister," who was standing at the North-side or end of the Table. Every possible objection, meanwhile, was met in regard to the people hearing what was said; at the same time that religious propriety was observed throughout, in regard to what was addressed to God in prayer, or addressed to the people in exhortation or blessing.

Bishop Cosin's friend and Archdeacon, Dr. Basire, has observed in a note, that this Form of Consecration agreed with that of Bishop Andrewes. "Consonat cum Formâ Reverendi in Christo Patris Lanceloti Andrewes, edit. anno 1659." "But it is only a general agreement," says the Editor of Bishop Cosin's *Correspondence*. "Cosin has given it the impress of his own hand."

The Form is, however, in all its main features, in close agreement with that of Bishop Andrewes, as used by him at the

consecration of Jesus Chapel, Southampton. The long prayer of dedication is said by the bishop and the founder, with the chaplains, within the door of the chapel, "kneeling where they may conveniently be seen and heard by the people" without; with the like petitions said "kneeling before the Holy Table" ("Grant that this place," etc.) One chaplain, first "bowing before the Holy Table," says the Morning Prayer, the Bishop adding a special Collect; then the other chaplain, with like reverence first made, says the Litany, the Bishop adding a prayer; then after the Sermon, the Order of Holy Communion is proceeded with, one chaplain being at the south, and the other at the north side (*ad septentrionalem partem*) of the Holy Table; one chaplain, standing before the Holy Table, reads the Epistle, the other—the first ("prior")—standing in like manner and reading the Gospel. The Bishop then, going from his seat, bows himself down before the Holy Table and says: "Let us pray the prayer," etc. "Then follows the promulgation of the sentence of Consecration," etc. The prayer ended, the Bishop takes his seat apart where he was before; and the non-communicants being dismissed, and the door closed, the first chaplain goes on to read the sentences for the Offertory, whilst the other chaplain collects the alms. Everything else being duly performed, the Bishop then returns to the Holy Table (both chaplains receding a little), and after washing his hands, and breaking the Bread, and pouring out the Wine into the chalice, and mixing water with it, says standing:

"Almighty God, our heavenly Father, who of His great mercy, hath," etc.

This, I apprehend, is a slight error in printing, and should be, as in the beginning of the Prayer of Consecration: "Almighty God, our heavenly Father, who of Thy tender mercy didst give," etc.

After the administration, by the Bishop, the first chaplain following him with the cup, it is said:

"The Bishop at the north side of the Holy Table ('ad sacræ mensæ septentrionem') says the Lord's Prayer kneeling," with a concluding collect, "and then, standing, dismisses the people with the Benediction."

The only difference observable between this form and Bishop

Cosin's is, that the Bishop consecrates, and, it would rather appear, standing before the Table. This would tend to confirm the conclusion already drawn from the wording of the Rubric before the Prayer of Consecration introduced by Bishop Cosin at the last Review, that this point was designedly left open; the chief Minister all through the rest of the Service, both before and after, standing at the North side of the Table. The absence, meanwhile, of any direction as to an eastward position will appear the more observable, when we find that at the Consecration of the burial ground, in the afternoon, the Bishop is described as standing on the eastern part of the ground, "*ad orientalem cœmeterii partem stans.*"

The Bishop's chaplains in attendance on this occasion were Matthew and Christopher Wren. The Rubric which Bishop Wren himself, some forty years afterwards, proposed at the last Review, for insertion before the Prayer of Consecration, has been already considered, in its close resemblance to Bishop Cosin's. Throughout the rest of the Service he, like Bishop Cosin, following Bishop Andrewes, specifies the North side of the Table as the place of the officiating Priest. He proposed, as amended Rubrics, the following:

"And the Priest, standing at the *North of the Table*, the people all kneeling, shall begin with the Lord's Prayer. . . .

"Then the Priest, *turning his face towards the people*, shall rehearse," etc.

"Then the Priest, at the Holy Table, *where he stood at first* . . . shall say

"When the Distribution is ended, the Priest, *standing at the Table as he did at the first*, shall begin the Lord's Prayer. . . ."

The Bishop of Chester, who recently, in his *Fragmentary Illustrations*, etc., published these suggested Rubrics of Bishop Wren, "in his prefatory matter merely says: 'Standing at the north of the table is directed, p. 74, and recognised, pp. 75 and 81.'" An explanation has been suggested, which, it is thought, had not occurred to the Bishop, viz. that "Bishop Wren was, as a compromise, simply giving up the eastward position for the *earlier* part of the service" only. It has been forgotten, I think, that the last of Bishop Wren's proposed rubrics (p. 81) distinctly ordered the return of the Priest to the North side for

the *later* part of the Service, *after* the Consecration and distribution of the elements.

It has appeared already how prominent a place oblations at the Altar occupied in Bishop Andrewes' view; and the Notes written by him in his Prayer Book seem fully to illustrate the description of the arrangements of his Chapel. After the Litany there go up to the Altar the "two Priests, the one at the one end, the other at the other,"—this to the good Bishop's eyes—so it was, we find—"representing the two Cherubim at the mercy-seat." The Nicene Creed read, the Priest "removes the basin from the back of the Altar to the forepart. The Bishop ascends with triple adoration, and lastly kneels down at the Altar." Into his hands the Priest, from the "bystanding table on the south side," reaches the sacred elements; and these the Bishop offers, in the name of the whole congregation, upon the Altar. Then he offers into the basin for himself, and after him the whole congregation, "and so betake themselves to their proper and convenient place of kneeling; Bishops and Priests only within the *septum* . . . the Priest meanwhile reading the peculiar Sentences for the Offertory."

The arrangements of Bishop Andrewes' chapel, and his practice as illustrated thereby, are, I cannot but think, clear beyond dispute, though somewhat novel interpretations of them *have* been offered. The plan of the chapel, with descriptive notes, was published, it will be remembered, by Prynne, having been found by him among Laud's papers, endorsed in the Archbishop's own hand. Bishop Andrewes' chapel was avowedly the pattern of Laud's, and so illustrates the usages of Laud himself, of Wren, and Cosin, and others of that age. There was, it appears, at the back of the altar, "a cushion," and in front of the cushion "the basin for oblations." The cushion placed before "the two candlesticks," I cannot doubt, was for the alms basin to rest upon: the cushion and the basin, it is to be observed, appear close together; and in the list of "Plate for the Chapel" we find two round basins, one "for offerings," and another "for alms." There was a "cushion for the service-book" at the north side or end of the Table, and on the north and south sides there were "the kneeling stools," clearly for the two officiating chaplains. Between the "two patens" in

the middle of the Table in front, there is a cross marked ; and this, it appears from the description, indicates the place of "the tricanale, being a round ball with a screw cover, whereout issued three pipes, and is for the water of mixture." "What does all this show?" says an ingenious commentator; "I should say," he replies, "that it showed that the north end was intended as the place of official dignity for the Bishop to kneel at, and in general to follow the bulk of the service (whether said by self or chaplain) with his book, which would rest upon the cushion; but that the centre was reserved for the consecration itself." An entirely arbitrary supposition! Yet, in support of it, it is argued, "Surely this inference stands to reason; for if Andrewes' Practice had been to consecrate at the north end, he never would have hampered that particular part of the table with a cushion, which would make the decent performance of the rite on his part so very difficult; nor would he have so emphatically shown the sacred vessels ranged exactly in the middle. It is somewhat curious," the writer goes on to say, "that while in the key he employs letters, Greek or capital Roman, for reference to the other articles," Andrewes "uses a cross to indicate the place of the vessel of admixture, and that this happens to stand in the exact centre of the Holy Table; I cannot help surmising," says the writer, "that this exceptional use of the cross as a mark of reference in the key was intended as a sort of private note that that central point of the Table was to be used as the place of consecration." It is rather a recondite surmise; and I must confess I cannot see the slightest ground for it; the cross seems clearly, in the paper of description, to be a reference for "the tricanale," and nothing else. The cushion for the service-book is represented as small, and it need not have been any hindrance. And the place of official dignity for the Bishop is definitely marked in the plan, just within the rails, the chair on which he sat "at the communion time."

There is one place only, in the Service, in which Bishop Andrewes distinctly contemplates the Minister as kneeling at the head of the people, and thus, it may be said, symbolically representing them. Before the Prayer of humble access, "We do not presume," on the words—"Then shall the priest, kneeling down," he inserts his note—["*Descendit, repetit solus.*"]

Then on the rubric before the Prayer of Consecration as it then stood—"The Priest standing up shall say the Prayer of Consecration"—he describes fully the preparations made for the act of consecration; with this clause subjoined, "*postremo omnibus ritè et quam fieri potest, decentissime atque aptissime compositis, stans pergit et peragit.*" In rariore solemnitate hic pergit Episcopus et consecrat." At the end of the Service, according to Bishop Andrewes' suggestion, the congregation leave the Choir, and "go towards their seats for a little private Devotion." "In their way, at the foot of the Choir, stands the *cippus pauperum*, into which every man puts a small piece of silver; whilst the Priest, *standing still at the altar*, readeth the exhortatory sentences for alms," and "when all are composed in their seats, he proceeds to the Blessing."

Bishop Wren, in like manner in his draft of rubrics, already referred to. The Bread and Wine being presented by the Churchwardens, or some other for them, the Priest "kneeling down *before the Table*, shall in the name of all present, say, We do not presume," etc. There is nowhere else this direction given in regard to kneeling before the Table during prayer.

Our view, however, of Bishop Andrewes' order of ritual will not be complete without reference to "the Forme used by him in consecrating the new Church plate of the Cathedral Church of Worcester," first printed in the edition of his works in the Anglo-Catholic Library (vol. xi.). It is worthy of attention, because "this Form of consecrating Communion Plate seems to have been regarded as a model, and is frequently alluded to: e. g. such consecration was charged against Archbishop Laud at his trial: his answer was, 'All that I used was according to the copy of the late Reverend Bishop of Winchester, Bishop Andrewes, which I have by me to be seen, and which himself used all his time.'"¹

The principal points in the order of Service are as follows.

"The plate to be consecrated is placed upon a Table about the middle of the quire before the beginning of Divine Service.

"Immediately after the Nicene Creed, and the pronouncing of this sentence, Let your light, etc., the Presenter of the plate

¹ Bishop ANDREWES' *Works*, vol. xi. p. 159.

being in his choral habit (if he be a Churchman) cometh forth, and standing by the said Table, after obeisance first to God, and to the Bishop, saith

“*Presenter.* Reverend Father in God, in the name of the Dean and Chapter of the Cathedral Church of Worcester, I humbly beseech your Lordship that some vessels prepared for the use of that Church here ready may be presented unto the Lord, and by your sacred office may receive an holy dedication unto godly divine service.

“*The Bishop.* We are ready to do what you desire, etc. . . . First, therefore, let us begin with prayer. O Eternal God, Lord of all power and glory, etc.

“The said Presenter taketh in his hands

“First, the paten, and (after obeisance) cometh up to the Bishop *standing before the midst* of the Altar, and kneeling down saith,

“I offer this unto thee, and thy holy service, O Lord God Almighty.

“The Bishop receiveth them and *turneth to set* them on the Altar, his chaplains standing on each side of the Altar . . . and in the meantime saying *alternatim*

“(a) He rained down manna, etc.

“(b) So man did eat angels’ food, etc.

“In the meantime the Presenter is ready with the chalices covered, and kneeling down, saith (*ut prius*).

“Whiles the Bishop sets them on, the chaplains pronounce

“(a) That he may bring food,” etc.

In like manner with the flagons, the candlesticks, and the censer; the two chaplains, in each case, reciting alternately appropriate verses.

“Then the Bishop *layeth his hands upon every piece again*, and standing saith,

“O Lord, heavenly Father, we most meekly beseech thee favourably to accept these holy offerings now presented unto thee,” etc.

This was a prayer, in its manual acts and general character, corresponding in some sort with the solemn Prayer of Consecration, in the Communion Office; with the like absence of any absolute direction in regard to the position of the Bishop, while yet his part in the service is distinct from that of the principal minister, or celebrant, throughout the Service.

Then follows "The Benediction."

"We bless thee, O Lord, for thy blessings upon us, and for that it hath pleased thee," etc.

"This done, they proceed to read the other sentences, for the ordinary offerings, and so go on with the rest of the Communion."

The chaplains would here be officiating in like manner as in the form of Consecration of a Church, the principal Minister at the North side. There is here one consistent usage and order throughout.

"In the Life of Kettlewell ; . . . is an account of the consecration of a new set of Communion plate for the Church at Coleshill, by Archbishop Sancroft. . . . The words of the prayers are given, and evidence that it was Andrewes' form which was used." "The service is substantially the same as this of Bishop Andrewes, which was indeed, as it now appears, in Archbishop Sancroft's possession. Thus it is sanctioned by the use of these two Archbishops."¹ In the account given in Kettlewell's Life, the solemn offering of the sacred vessels and then, afterwards, "the Prayer of Consecration," as it is called, appear in all their distinctness. The several vessels, viz. a paten, two chalices, a flagon, and a basin—were presented by the Vicar, in the name of the patron, Lord Digby, the donor. The Archbishop, we are told, "*standing before the midst of the Altar*, did receive, in the name of God, from the hands of the Presenter kneeling, each piece of plate severally, and place it upon the altar decently spread ; several sentences of Scripture, adapted to the offering of each of them, being alternately repeated, as he was thus placing them, and praying over them. Which being ended, *there followed the Prayer of Consecration*, which was after this form ; viz. 'Unto thee, O ever blessed Lord and Saviour, and to thy most holy worship and service do I here offer up and dedicate these oblations [*Here he laid his hands upon every piece of the plate*] which . . . thy pious and devout servant hath here presented unto thee. But who is he, O Lord, etc.

"After which *the Archbishop* added this Benediction following, 'And, now, blessed be thou,' etc. Then the Archbishop went

¹ Bishop ANDREWES' *Works*, *sup. cit.* p. 160.

on to read some other sentences in the Offertory ; and Bread and Wine upon, and in, the vessels now consecrated were set upon the Communion Table, etc., and the Order for the administration of the Holy Communion was, according to the use of the Church of England, proceeded in, with which the solemnity ended."

These various forms of Consecration Services give valuable illustration—the more so by reason of their variety—of the usages of Bishop Andrewes, and those who followed him in the next generation and onwards, in regard to the Communion Office. They show, for instance, that, because a solemn oblation was made "before" the Holy Table, it cannot safely be inferred that the rest of the Service was performed in the same position. Again, there is found in these forms just the amount of variety which has been already noted in regard to the position of the priest during the Prayer of Consecration in the Office for the Holy Communion. The volume already referred to in the Lambeth Library contains, in the same handwriting, the "Service for the Consecration of the Church of Dore, in Herefordshire, by Theophilus (Field), Bishop of St. David's, acting for Bishop Wren, March 22, 1634." After the like preparations for the Consecration of the elements as in Bishop Andrewes' forms, we find this direction for the bishop,—"*standing with his face to the Table about the midst of it*, he saith the Collect of Consecration." Whether this Order of Service was drawn up by Bishop Field or by Bishop Wren, does not distinctly appear. If, as is supposed, it was by Bishop Wren, we know, from what has been already quoted from his defence, the view he took of the matter ; and that, in what he did on the occasion referred to in his trial, he was guided simply by considerations of convenience and decency.

A few words, however, must here be said on this point, because, by the like fatality to which I have alluded before, there has been conduct attributed to him, as well as to Archbishop Laud and Bishop Cosin, which hitherto none of their bitterest enemies ever laid to their charge. Bishop Wren's defence must be quoted rather more fully than it was given before. "He declares that he doth use the consecrating form the Church of England hath appointed, and no other : viz. he doth it standing at the Lord's Table, with the Bread and Wine placed openly

before him. . . . He acknowledgeth that for the better taking of the Bread, and for the easier reaching both of the flagon and the cup (because they stood upon the Table further from the end thereof than he, being but low of stature, could reach over his book unto them, and yet still proceed on in reading of the words without stop or interruption, and without spilling the Bread and Wine) he did *in Tower Church, in Ipswich*, anno 1636, turn unto the west side of the Table; but it was only while he rehearsed the forementioned Collect, in which he was to take the Bread and the Wine, and at no other time. And he humbly conceiveth that, though the rubric says that the Minister shall stand at the north side of the table, yet it is not so to be meant as that upon no occasion during the Communion time he shall step from it. . . . Insomuch, therefore, as he did stand at the north side all the while before he came to that Collect, wherein he was to take the Bread and Wine into his hands, and as soon as that was done, thither he returned again; he humbly conceiveth it is a plain demonstration that he came to the West side only for more conveniency of executing his office, and no way in any superstition, much less in any imitation of the Romish priests; for they place themselves there at all the service before and at all after, with no less strictness than at the time of their consecrating the Bread and Wine." Thus much in regard to that one occasion—the only one, as the Bishop's words imply. Meanwhile, without any exception, in regard to the charge of elevating the sacred elements, he says, "This defendant is ready to pronounce *anathema* to any superstitious or idolatrous usages or intentions by him in that kind *ever* had, and to profess that he doth faithfully and totally adhere to the Articles of the Church of England, that the Sacrament is not to be carried about, lifted up, or worshipped." Bishop Wren, it will be observed, raises no question as to the North "side" of the Table; and felt no difficulty whatever about it.

Thus much in regard to Bishop Wren. Archbishop Laud had laid to his charge the Rubric in the Scottish Prayer Book, which, in the language of the indictment, might "seem to be no great matter," yet "being tried, it importeth much." "The Rubric professeth," said the Archbishop in his defence, "that

nothing is meant by it, but that he may use both his hands with more ease and decency about that work. *And I protest in the presence of Almighty God, I know of no other intention herein than this.*"

In reference to this subject, I must say I would rather not copy what I have read in divers writers, or heard spoken by one speaker in Convocation,—for I heard it, and have read it, with great regret,—that Archbishop Laud and Bishop Wren had really all the while ulterior reasons, but, being desirous of saving their lives, in fact solemnly denied it. Archbishop Laud had his faults of temper, and committed great errors in prudence and policy; and "grievously" he "answered it": but cowardice and falsehood were not among them. And the like may be said of Bishop Wren. The death of the one, and the long captivity of the other, as well as the known and tried character of them both, ought to have defended them effectually from any such unworthy suspicions. A man on his trial is not bound to volunteer a statement of all his opinions: it is another thing solemnly to call God to witness that, on a certain point laid to his charge, there is nothing behind. Laud and Wren, it will moreover be remembered, were both members—and prominent members—of the Convocation which laid down the principles stated in the Declaration above cited, of 1640, respecting the position of the Minister, and its doctrinal non-importance.

We find Cosin, in like manner, in answer to the charge of "officiating towards the east, with his back to the people," in Durham Cathedral, "denieth that he ever did officiate with face *purposely* towards the east. But he constantly stood at the north side, or end, of the Table, to read and perform all parts of the Communion Service there; saving that, the Bread and Wine being usually placed in the middle of the Table, which is about seven feet in length, he might *haply* do as others did there before him (*though he remembereth not to have so done these twelve years*), and step to the former part thereof, and consecrate and bless these elements, which otherwise he could not *conveniently* reach."

This threefold testimony of Laud, Wren, and Cosin, must, surely, be regarded as conclusive on the question what their feeling and practice was; and it furnishes a consistent com-

mentary on the words of the rubric, which had Bishop Cosin for its author; designed, as we have seen it was, for avoiding the difficulties which they had experienced, and the suspicions and accusations from which they had all three suffered; and providing for the priest's so ordering the bread and wine "that he may with *the more readiness and decency* break the bread before the people, and take the cup into his hands."

Another rubric, then first introduced into the Communion Office, must be referred to, before we leave the proceedings at the last Review, as being closely connected with that which has been under our special consideration. It was a new rubric that ordered that, "when there is a Communion the priest," after receiving the alms and other devotions of the people in a decent basin, and humbly presenting it and placing it upon the holy Table, "shall then place upon the Table so much Bread and Wine as he shall think sufficient." The absence of such a direction had been noted with regret by the learned Joseph Mede many years before. He had been speaking of the oblation which was so distinctive a feature of the Holy Communion as testified by the earliest records of the primitive Church, and thereupon asks the question, "If all this be so, how is not our celebration of the Eucharist defective, where no such oblation is used?" "I answer, This concerns not us alone, but all the Churches of the West, of the Roman Communion, who, as in other things they have depraved this mystery, and swerved from the primitive pattern thereof, so have they, for many ages, disused this oblation of Bread and Wine, and brought in, in lieu thereof, a real and hypostatical oblation of Christ Himself. This blasphemous oblation we have taken away, and justly; but not reduced again that express and formal use of the other. Howsoever, though we do it not with a set ceremony and form of words, yet in deed and effect we do it, so often as we set the Bread and Wine upon the Holy Table; for whatsoever we set upon God's Table, is *ipso facto* dedicated and offered unto Him; according to that of our Saviour, 'The altar sanctifies the gift,'¹ that is, consecrates it unto God, and appropriates it to His use. In which respect *it were much to be wished that this were more solemnly* done than is usual; namely, not until the time of the

¹ S. Matt. xxiii. 19.

administration, and by the hand of the minister, in the name and sight of the whole congregation standing up, and showing some sign of due and lowly reverence."

Joseph Mede had early attracted the notice of Bishop Andrewes, who would gladly have received him into his household as one of his chaplains. Archbishop Laud was his friend; and what Cosin thought of him appears sufficiently from a brief passage in a letter of his from Durham (August 4, 1637) written in the midst of the Altar and Table controversy between Heylyn and Williams.¹

"Sir,—You have been as good as your word; for every copy of your book which you sent me (besides mine own) I have had many solemn thanks returned me from those friends here upon whom I bestowed them, all of which I return and bestow upon you again. They read it over and over, and are so well affected with it, that we all say here (except one of whom I shall tell you hereafter) it will certainly conduce to the settling of men's minds and judgments in this question, more than all the other writings which have gone forth about it."

"There can be little doubt," as the editor of the *Correspondence* observes, that "the book which Cosin refers to is a tractate which Joseph Mede published in 1637, under the following title: '*The Name Altar, or Θυσιαστήριον, anciently given to the Holy Table. A Commonplace, or Theological Discourse, in a Colledge Chappell, more than two years since. By Joseph Mede, B.D., and Fellow of Christ's Colledge in Cambridge.*'"

The solemn placing of the elements as a sacred oblation, *before consecration*, on the Holy Table, in conformity with primitive practice, so different from the later corruptions of Rome—an oblation, meanwhile, which no one could doubt would fitly and naturally be placed on the middle of the Table—would make more suitable and necessary the new rubric before the Prayer of Consecration: the two Rubrics mutually illustrate and explain each other. It were greatly to be wished, that those who are justly apprehensive of any approach to Romish doctrine in regard to a "real and hypostatical oblation" would see the expediency as well as the propriety of conforming herein, as

¹ COSIN'S *Correspondence*, vol. i. p. 220.

there seems indeed a disposition in some quarters to conform, to the plain directions of the Rubric.

Upon one other point in connection with the proceedings preparatory to the last Review, a word must be added. The Puritans at the Savoy Conference had said in their notes on the Communion Service, "The minister turning himself to the people is most convenient throughout the whole ministration." The reply of the bishops was, "The minister turning to the people is not most convenient throughout the whole ministration. When he speaks to them as in lessons, absolution, and benedictions, it is convenient that he turn to them. When he speaks for them to God, it is fit they should all turn another way, as the ancient Church ever did. . . ." But this certainly did not mean—what it has been supposed to mean—turning always *eastward* in prayer. It implied precisely that distinction which is marked in our Communion office by the minister turning sometimes to the people, sometimes *to the Table*. The Rubric on which the Puritans were commenting, it may be observed, was that which stands before the *Absolution*. The places of solemn worship throughout the land, the choirs of our cathedrals, abbey churches, and all religious houses, were arranged with the seats, or stalls, looking south or north. The turning to the east in reciting the Creed affords a remarkable exception to this arrangement, and rests upon its own peculiar grounds; as does also the saying of the Litany in the midst of the churches, as of old in the Jewish Temple, "between the porch and the altar."

We have now examined, I think, with sufficient care the main historic facts and documents which throw light upon the question of the true interpretation of the Rubric before us; whether derived from the Prayer Book itself, from the writings or practice of Bishop Cosin, by whom it was undoubtedly drawn up, or of those high authorities among the bishops and divines of the Church of England with whose views and principles his own were in full accordance—Bishop Andrewes, Archbishop Laud, Bishop Wren, Archbishop Sancroft, and others. I am not conscious of having neglected any source from whence material assistance might be derived; although I have ab-

stained from specifying the several contributors, in books, pamphlets, reviews, or letters in the public journals, whose pages or columns I have not the less carefully studied, though I have omitted distinct reference to them, in the anxiety to avoid giving the discussion of the question a "controversial" character. To have noticed every particular, and every argument—in some cases somewhat extraordinary—which has been offered on the facts, or supposed facts, of the case, would have swelled these Notes far beyond the limits which I had prescribed to myself, and which they have already, to my regret, unavoidably exceeded. And I may now, perhaps, venture to state, in few words, my conclusion. And the only conclusion which I can come to, as at present advised, is this; that, if I find myself called upon,—as I feel I am, by the provisions of the recent Act, under the circumstances of my own archdeaconry,—to form an "opinion," in regard to the question which might not improbably arise, as to the position of the minister while saying the Prayer of Consecration, I must say that I should not think myself justified in making a "representation" to the Diocesan, with a view to penal proceedings under the "Public Worship Regulation Act," to the effect that the incumbent had "failed to observe the directions contained in the Book of Common Prayer," or had made an "unlawful alteration of such services, rites, and ceremonies." It appears to me that, when the Rubric directs that the priest stand "before the Table" to order the Bread and Wine, it clearly means "in front" (as that phrase would be commonly understood); but I think also that the same Rubric, whether considered in itself, in its grammatical construction, or by the light of high authorities in past times, must be regarded as not absolutely and strictly defining the position in which the Prayer which follows is to be said. What the framers of the Rubric intended I have myself no doubt; and the usage of all cathedrals, royal chapels, and college chapels, from that day till the time of the present generation is, to my mind, an irresistible argument. And I should be ready and willing, in my office of archdeacon, to give my advice or direction in any case in which it was desired by those immediately concerned. But looking back through the history of the last three hundred years, to the

provision which has been made for the exercise of episcopal discretion, under the various circumstances of different places, it appears to me not less clearly one of those matters with which, if any difference arises from doubt or diverse taking of the Rubric, the bishop is to deal, or, in the words of the recent resolution of the Lower House of Convocation, "to determine which usage shall be adopted." It would be easy, of course, by some "rough and ready legislation" in this and other matters, to propose, and press, some alteration of the Rubric which would make everything unambiguous, precise, and stringent; but it would be simply to undo the careful work of past generations; to ignore their patient, learned, and charitable labours; and to rough-ride consciences on this side or that—consciencs, it may be, in some cases more sensitive, in some perhaps more captious, than well-regulated or well-informed—yet still not the less requiring tender and considerate treatment; to give a triumph to party spirit in one direction or another, with a greater triumph to Rome and to Infidelity; to sow the seeds of bitterness and strife, and to rend asunder the Church of God.

It has been said above (p. 60), that from the time when the present Rubric was enacted, during the last two hundred years, down to the days of the present generation, the North-side position of the Priest, with the qualifications before noticed, has been, as I believe, the constant and unvarying usage in all our Cathedrals and College Chapels, till within the last few years. I took occasion, in the course of my Charge, to observe to how great an extent the existing variety of practice had arisen out of the varying decisions of the Judicial Committee, rather than out of the practice of individual clergy in past times, or any continuous tradition, the satisfactory proof of which, as I then stated, appears to me to be wanting. I expressed this the rather, because it seemed to me important to be borne in mind, as entitling the existing diversity of practice to the more considerate treatment of Clergy or congregations concerned in it, in regard to the enforcement upon them of a contrary decision of the Committee.

With regard to the practice of individual Clergy in past

times, reference has been made to "Mr. Simeon's practice during his life," which "was still the practice," as it was stated, "of an eminent clergyman of the same school." The latter gentleman, it appears, has since informed the writer by whom reference had been made to his practice, that he had "discontinued the practice ever since the inquiry was made of him" (in 1852). Canon Carus, it appears, has also written to say, that he "attended Mr. Simeon's church from 1823 till his death in 1836, and never saw him consecrate in front of the Holy Table;" and another curate of Mr. Simeon's, from 1829 till 1836, says his position was "invariably and undeviatingly on the North-side of the Table." It may be, as is presumed, that "he may have adopted the front position in his earlier years, and laid it aside, for some reason or other, afterwards." In some other cases that have been referred to, I cannot but think there has been a mistake, owing to imperfect recollection of times now remote. For instance, it was certainly not Mr. Hugh James Rose's accustomed practice. It was stated by a member, in the Lower House of Convocation, that he "had a letter from" a clergyman, "who was in treaty with the Rev. Hugh James Rose about a curacy at Hadleigh, and one condition upon which that eminent man told this candidate for his curacy he should expect conformity was, that he should use the position which he (Mr. Rose) always did during the celebration of the Holy Communion; and that was that in consecration he should stand facing eastward." This seemed tolerably precise and circumstantial. On inquiry, however, of the clergyman in question, he informs me as follows, viz. that negotiations took place between an uncle of his, to whom he was then curate, and Mr. Rose, in regard to the curacy of Hadleigh; and both from his uncle and from Mr. Rose, with whom he had a short interview, he understood that he should be required to follow his mode of celebrating the Holy Sacrament. He "asked what that was, when something was said about always standing in front of the Table; but," he adds, "whether this had reference to standing facing eastward during all the office, or *whether only during the arrangement of the elements* previous to consecration, is more than I can venture, at this distance of time, to say." From my own personal knowledge, and inquiries which I have made, I have no

doubt that the practice which Mr. Rose observed and insisted upon, was the placing the elements by the celebrant at the proper time on the Lord's Table, and afterwards ordering the Bread and Wine, according to the Rubric, "standing before the Table"; but that he did *not* consecrate at the West side. It certainly was not his practice. In regard to other cases, it is 'very conceivable that Romaine and others, who took their own ground very much,—and greatly to their honour, in some respects,—in matters concerning the Prayer Book, so read the Rubric for themselves, and acted accordingly. It may have been so, in like manner, with other individual clergymen of a different school. And when a usage like this had been introduced into a parish, and observed for many years, it would, not unnaturally, be handed on. But as regards College Chapels, the inquiries I have made confirm my own recollections and impressions. Bishop Legge, Dr. Routh, and Dr. Hodson have been referred to. I have reason to think that Bishop Legge, as Warden of All Souls, in the Chapel of the College, stood on the North side; and so did Dr. Routh, I believe, in Magdalen College Chapel; and, in like manner, Dr. Hodson at Brasenose College. Mention has been made of "the kneeling stool in front of the Holy Table in Brasenose College Chapel." This, however, would be no evidence, and indeed would rather tell if anything the other way. The kneeling stool was doubtless placed there for presenting the alms and oblations; it would rather be in the way of the priest *standing* to consecrate at the middle of the Table. In Canterbury Cathedral there would be seen a kneeling stool before the Table every Sunday and on other Communion days; but any one who should infer from it that the priest stood there to consecrate would draw an erroneous conclusion.

Without in the slightest degree calling in question the veracity of alleged eye-witnesses, I cannot but think that in some cases a mistake has been made; that what attracted attention was the officiating minister being seen standing in front of the Table before the Prayer of Consecration, to arrange the elements, while, naturally enough, perhaps, there was not the same notice taken where he stood during the Prayer which followed. Be this, however, as it may, there is abundant evidence attainable

that at the period referred to, viz. between 1814 and 1820, the fact is not what has been supposed, as the result of observation and inquiries made "very extensively both in London and in the provinces," in regard to the position assumed by the celebrant in consecration. "The result is said to have been that there was found to be" another practice than that of the eastward position, but "that it was comparatively rare"—"that the eastward was the prevailing position, and it was very jealously preserved by many." It is said that while men of the so-called Evangelical school "generally preferred consecrating at the north end," yet, that "several very high Evangelicals adhered to the words of the rubric, and two at least of that saintly band, who met at 6 A.M. winter and summer to celebrate the Holy Communion, insisted upon the eastward as the proper position of the consecrating minister. One of those two was Romaine." But in the course of the preceding twenty years (dating from the beginning of the century), it is said that "frequency of celebration had increased chiefly amongst the Evangelical section; and therefore the practice of the Evangelical school might almost give the rule of celebrating." This explanation and hypothesis are, I think it must be felt, far from convincing. If it be the fact that, about the years 1819 and 1820, among "leading men at Oxford there was found to be but one opinion, and all of those by whom it was mooted were so certain that 'standing before the Table and saying' could be taken in no other way than as in the Mackonochie judgment, and therefore no discussion could arise on that point," I cannot believe that this consentient opinion and practice were, throughout the Church, overset by the preference of the Evangelical clergy for a custom which, it would seem, was at variance with that of some of their most venerated leaders. In regard to those leaders, I can easily believe that, coming fresh to the question, they read the words in the rubric "standing before the table" in what appears to me their natural and rubrical sense, and that they may be claimed accordingly as witnesses in defence of that interpretation; the result of after consideration of the matter, by themselves or their followers, may have been that the words did not rule the question of the position during the Prayer; they attached to it themselves no doctrinal significance of an objectionable

character, and, especially if any such interpretation were by any persons attached to it, conformed to what was undoubtedly the general usage—the North-side position.

The traditional usage of the English Church—the universal tradition of her Cathedrals and principal Churches, Chapels Royal, and College Chapels—ought, I think, to protect that usage from the disparaging and disrespectful expressions in which some writers have of late indulged in respect to it—in fact, doing something very like openly attacking it. Such a course is not favourable to the liberty and toleration they would desire for their own practice: the great body of Churchmen would undoubtedly not be prepared to recognise it as “really the only position that has a single reasonable word to say for itself.”¹

To illustrate and vindicate the law or custom of our Church in this matter would involve an inquiry which would be out of place here: the object of this Note is simply to ascertain *what* that law is, and how much it has defined or left open. The other question would embrace much that is most sacred in doctrine, and deep in Scriptural interpretation, in regard to the usage of the Temple under the former dispensation, and of the new temple “in heavenly places in Christ,” the worship of which was unfolded in Apostolic vision, and reflected in the earliest records of the Christian Church.

The rule of the Prayer Book, which provides that, “for the resolution of all doubts,” and the settlement of all “diversity” that may arise, the parties “shall always resort to the Bishop of the Diocese, who by his discretion shall take order for the quieting and appeasing of the same,” implies that it will be the duty of the parties concerned—whether clergy or laity, no doubt, though this is sometimes forgotten—to conform to the

¹ And common reverence for holy things, I must take leave to add, revolts at such an argument as this—“Let anybody,” it is said, “do anything whatsoever on a table placed and shaped like an altar; let it be a baker to knead bread, or a butcher to cut meat, or a tailor to cut cloth, or a laundry-maid to iron linen; and who can doubt that the front position will at once be chosen?” Such a passage painfully savours of the irreverence of Puritans and Romanists of former days.

“order” he may take, within the limits fixed by the Prayer Book itself; “following with a glad mind and will his godly admonitions, and submitting themselves to his godly judgments.” The recent Act simply provides that, on receiving a “representation,” the bishop shall require both parties “to state in writing within one and twenty days, *whether they are willing to submit* to the directions of the bishop touching the matter of the said representation, without appeal.” If they *are*, he proceeds to hear the matter, and pronounce judgment, or issue his monition; “such judgment not to be considered as finally deciding any question of law so that it may not be raised again by other parties.” If the parties are *not* willing so to submit to the directions of the bishop, then the bishop is forthwith to transmit the representation to the Archbishop, and the Archbishop shall forthwith require the judge to hear the matter. In fact, if the parties will not abide by the Church’s rule, and be governed by those who are set in authority in the Church, they may appeal to the court which the State has authorised. If a man has “appealed unto Cæsar,” “unto Cæsar” he must “go”; but, having done so, he must not then turn round, and say that the court thus constituted, being a secular one, has no authority over his conscience. If men prefer a court in which none but legal functionaries are the judges, be it so; but it is not competent for them then to say that such court has no spiritual authority, and that they are at liberty to set it at nought. The best service rendered by the recent Act will be, if it suggests to men’s minds to find in the spiritual Rulers of the Church those of whom it may be said—as it may, in the words of Pope’s description of the Man of Ross, when the filial and paternal relations between clergy and their bishops are duly recognised and faithfully observed between them—

“Is there contention? Enter but his door,
Balked are the courts, and contest is no more.”

In a recent article in an influential Review it is said, “A power is given to the Bishop which, if wisely used, may yet be the means of healing many a breach. The Bishop may refuse to send on the plaint for hearing, stating in writing his reasons for the refusal. And he may also act as arbitrator

between the parties, if they agree to accept him ; and upon them his decision shall be binding, though not, of course, upon others. . . . A power almost without a parallel has been entrusted to the Bishops, and there is no reason to doubt that it will be used so as to bring about a settlement of disputes without resort to the Courts." The reviewer adds, "We agree that a Church cannot subsist by prosecutions: these are the crisis of a disease."¹

The real danger of the Church assuredly is, that of courts, nominally Church courts, ignoring Church law, and adopting rules of expediency and policy, or principles which apply well enough to the interpretation of ordinary Acts of Parliament, but not to the Church's rules as embodied in Rubrics and Canons. It is the glory of an Act of Parliament to be as precise as possible in its definitions of offences against its provisions, and in its penal clauses: it is the glory of a Church, within the limits of essential truth and necessary uniformity, to avoid laying down "hard and fast lines" in matters for which Christ ordained, and His Apostles established, an order of things which left great room for discretionary government in the hands of the Church's duly appointed rulers.

2. The question of the "position of the Celebrant" (as it is now commonly described) during the Prayer of Consecration has been, in the foregoing pages, the more fully discussed because, from circumstances which need not more particularly be specified, the question not long ago came into a prominent place, in the archdeaconry, and the diocese, with which the writer is, personally and officially, connected. It is also a question which did not come under discussion at the time—now just thirty years ago—when other "Rubrics respecting the Sermon and the Communion Service" were carefully examined by him, by the light of an "historical inquiry" into the circumstances under which they were originally drawn up, or subsequently altered. Of the "Ornaments Rubric," in particular, which has of late years attracted so much more attention, it was found necessary, at that time, to examine the history somewhat minutely ; and the conclusion to which the writer then came in

¹ *Quarterly Review* for July 1875, p. 274.

regard to it he has seen no reason meanwhile to alter. Documents which have since that time come to light have, in fact, tended to confirm the conclusion he had come to; which was, that in the "Advertisements" of Queen Elizabeth, "according to the provision of the Act of Uniformity, 'other order' was 'taken' in regard to the ornaments of the Minister, 'by the authority of the Queen's Majesty, with the advice of the Episcopal members of the Commission appointed and authorised under the Great Seal of England for Causes Ecclesiastical,' and specially and immediately 'of the Metropolitan of this Realm.'" ¹ It appeared clear, as the course of the history was followed out through the somewhat perplexed narrative of the historian, that the Advertisements were not acted upon—and indeed (as was felt by those concerned) *could* not be—until they had obtained what was regarded as full and sufficient authority from the Queen. It is not necessary here to go again over the argument grounded on the historical documents involved; or to vindicate the propriety and reasonableness of examining the book of Advertisements and the subsequent Canons of 1603, which so closely copied them, in the interpretation of the Rubric as settled at the last Review. For indeed, it is not as if the Order of the first Book of Edward VI. had been, in 1661, simply re-enacted, ignoring or overriding the Church's own canons. The fact that the wording of the former Rubric was altered, and the wording of Elizabeth's Act of Uniformity adopted, with an evident reference to the circumstances of the time, and the difficulties which beset them, can scarcely be regarded as an unimportant point. The change of the Rubric from "the Minister *shall use* such ornaments in the Church," to the formula, "that such ornaments of the Church and of the Ministers thereof *shall be retained and be in use*," is one among many instances of a very careful and well-considered modification of words, combining the *minimum* of change with the *maximum* of regard for men's consciences on both sides, and tender dealing with them. I may venture to repeat, having seen no reason to depart from the conclusion to which I had been led, that "in regard to the ornaments of the Minister, the further order contemplated by the Act of Uniformity had been taken, and was universally

¹ *Historical Inquiry*, p. 119.

recognised as of absolute legal authority; and the change had been effected according to the intention with which that provision had been made, i.e. 'quietly and without any show of novelty.' The Rubric continued as it was, viz. that the Minister . . . *shall use* such ornaments, etc.; but the order subsequently taken, not avowedly, but virtually and really, in conformity with the provisions of that Act, entirely satisfied, as it would seem, the consciences of Churchmen in the times of Hooker, Andrewes, and other their contemporaries, wise and well-informed men, and whom we justly look up to as patterns of high principle and sound judgment."¹

Allusion is made, in the preceding extract, to the *quiet* way in which certain changes were to be brought about, "without any show of novelty." It was provided in a Royal Letter, grounded on one clause in the Act of Uniformity, "that the alteration of anything hereby ensuing be *quietly* done, without show of any innovation in the Church."² It should be noticed here, by the way, that this passage in the Royal Letter has been recently quoted *twice* as if the word were "*quickly*," instead of "*quietly*."³ The correct reading is of considerable importance in its bearing on the matter in hand. But there is a point to which I wish to call attention, in illustration of the statement that the "order" thus taken was, "*not avowedly, but virtually and really* in conformity with the provisions of the Act." It is important, in reference to a conclusion which has been drawn *beyond* the line of the argument above referred to; to the effect, I mean, that the "order" taken not only legalised the non-observance of the strict law of the first Book of Edward VI., but went also to the point of making it "*illegal*."

In the course of the historical inquiry, I took occasion to notice that in Elizabeth's Act of Uniformity there was a reservation of power to the Queen to deal with certain matters in *both* directions, namely, that of *less* ceremony or *more*. The clause stood thus :

"Provided always, and be it enacted, That such ornaments of the Church and of the Ministers thereof shall be retained and

¹ *Historical Inquiry*, pp. 136, 137.

² *Ibid*, p. 84.

³ DROOP'S *Edwardian Vestments*, pp. 19. 21.

be in use, as were in this Church of England, by the authority of Parliament, in the second year of the reign of King Edward VI., until other order shall be therein taken by the authority of the Queen's Majesty, with the advice of her Commissioners, appointed and authorised under the Great Seal of England for Causes Ecclesiastical, or of the Metropolitan of this Realm."

And the clause went on to say :

"And *also*, that if there shall happen any contempt or irreverence to be used in the Ceremonies and Rites of the Church, by the misusing of the orders appointed in this Book, the Queen's Majesty may, *by the like advice* of the said Commissioners or Metropolitan, ordain and publish such further Ceremonies and Rites as may be most for the advancement of God's glory, the edifying of His Church, and the due reverence of Christ's holy mysteries and Sacraments."

The distinction between these two provisions, looking as they did in opposite directions, has been very commonly lost sight of. The power reserved in the *latter* part of the clause was speedily acted upon, viz. in the course of the very next year (1560). The Archbishop, sitting in the Commission, "found great neglect in many churches, and especially chancels, in keeping them decent; which betrayed much want of reverence towards the places where God was served. Many of the churches also were sadly out of repair, and run into decay, and were kept slovenly, with unseemly Communion tables, and foul cloths for the Communion, and want of ornaments for the place of prayer." The Archbishop therefore obtained Letters under the Great Seal (Jan. 22), taking order, among other things, "for the comely adorning of the east part of the churches," etc.; "and diligently to provide"—so the Letter ran—"that, whatsoever ye shall devise in this disorder, the order and reformation be of one sort and fashion; and that the things prescribed may accord in one form as nigh as may be. Specially that in all cathedral and collegiate churches, where cost may be more properly allowed, one manner to be used; and in all parish churches also, either the same, or at least the like, and one manner throughout our Realm." It is observable that in *this* case the Royal Letter expressly refers to the power reserved in the Act. It runs thus: "Letting you to understand that, *where it is*

provided by act of Parliament holden in the first year of our reign, that whensoever we shall see cause to take further order in any rite or ceremony, appointed in the Book of Common Prayer, and our pleasure known therein, either to our Commissioners for Causes Ecclesiastical or to the Metropolitan; that then eftsones consideration should be had therein; we therefore," etc.

When the Queen was, by virtue of the power thus reserved to her, to take action in the subsequent case, she required, enjoined, and strictly charged the Metropolitan, conferring with his brethren and primarily those who were in the Commission, "as the several cases should appear to require, so to proceed by order, injunction, or censure, *according to the order and appointment,*" it was said, "*of such laws and ordinances as are provided by Act of Parliament,* and the true meaning thereof. So as uniformity of order may be kept in every Church, and without variety and contention." "And yet in the execution hereof," the Letter went on to say, "we require you to use all good discretion, that hereof no trouble grow to the Church; neither that such as, out of frowardness and obstinacy, forbear to acknowledge our supreme authority over all sorts of our subjects, be hereby encouraged anywise to think that we mean to have any change of the policy, or of the laws already made and established, but that the same shall remain in their due force and strength." In this instance, it is to be observed, there is not the same express reference as before to the provisions of the Act of Uniformity; and, doubtless, this was done advisedly. When the proviso in question had been introduced into the Act of Uniformity, the common understanding—"our gloss upon this text," as Dr. Sandys expressed it to Parker—was, in regard to the ornaments of the first Book of King Edward, "that we shall not be forced to use them, but that others in the meantime shall not convey them away, but they may remain for the Queen." When the Queen, therefore, under the pressure of circumstances, took "other order" in the matter, she avoided such action, in the exercise of the power reserved to her, as would have made "illegal" what she desired still to retain for herself, and which she might lawfully retain as the recognised ritual of the Church of England, in its fulness; while the only hope of repressing

irregularity of the most flagrant kind was in putting forth, by authority, in conformity with provisions of the law, a modification of the ritual for general enforcement, with minor variation contemplated for Cathedrals and parish churches, yet consistently with the requirements of Uniformity.

In the case of this Rubric, as of that which has already been discussed, the greatest difficulty that has arisen has been in consequence of the different—and, to most men's minds, the differing—utterances of the Judicial Committee. In the Westerton case (1857) the Ornaments Rubric came under consideration. It was in reference to certain crosses, and the question was, whether the Rubric applied to them. The Judge of the Consistory Court of London (Dr. Lushington) had ruled that the reference in the Rubric must be to the Act of 2 and 3 Edward VI., and the Prayer Book which it established. His only perplexity was that, "although there were words in that Prayer Book describing the ornaments of the Ministers, there were none which applied to the ornaments of the Church, in his understanding of the expression." "Their Lordships, *after much consideration*," were "satisfied that the construction of this Rubric, which they suggested at the hearing of the case, is its true meaning; and that the word 'ornaments' applies, and in this Rubric is confined, to those articles the use of which in the services and ministrations of the Church, is prescribed by the Prayer Book of Edward VI." "All the several articles used in the performance and rites of the Church," so they decided, "are ornaments. *Vestments*, books, cloths, chalices, and patens are amongst Church ornaments." "No difficulty," therefore, would "be found in discovering" the missing "articles of which the use is there enjoined. Besides the *vestments* differing in the different services, the Rubric provides for the use of an English Bible," etc. . . . And moreover, "if reference be now made," it was said, "to the alterations in these matters introduced by the second Prayer Book of Edward VI. and the subsequent Rubric to the Prayer Book of Elizabeth, the meaning will be sufficiently clear. The second Prayer Book forbids the use of different *vestments* by the Priest, . . . and enjoins the use of a surplice only." Then came the "compromise" under Elizabeth; this was discussed, and the then new Rubric

compared with the Act of Uniformity, and the slight difference between them noticed; and the Rubric of the present Prayer Book. "They all," it is distinctly pronounced, "obviously mean the same thing, that the *same dresses* and the same utensils or articles which were used under the first Prayer Book of Edward VI. *may still be used.*"

This Report of the Judicial Committee was made March 21, 1857. It was a very full Committee that sat, consisting of Lord Chancellor Cranworth, Lord Wensleydale, Mr. Pemberton Leigh, Sir John Patteson, and Sir William H. Maule. "Privy Councillors specially summoned, the Archbishop of Canterbury (Sumner); Bishop of London (Tait)."¹

In the Mackonochie case (1868) the question of Vestments was not raised; but the Report of the Committee in the Westerton case was referred to in connection with the question of Lights. The Report said: "The construction of this rubric was *very fully considered* in the case of *Westerton v. Liddell*; and the propositions which their Lordships understand to have been *established* by the judgment in that case may be thus stated." These need not be repeated. The Report went on to say: "In these conclusions, and in this construction of the Rubric, their Lordships entirely concur."

In the Purchas case (1871) the question of Vestments came up; and "the learned Judge in the Court below" had "said that the plain words of the Statute, according to the ordinary principles of interpretation, and *the construction which they have received in two Judgments of the Privy Council*, oblige me to pronounce that the ornaments of the Minister, mentioned in the first Prayer Book of Edward VI., are those to which the present Rubric referred." The Judicial Committee found it "necessary to review shortly the history of the Rubric usually known as the 'Ornaments Rubric,' which governs this question." "The Respondent," as the Report stated, "had not appeared, and the Committee had not had the assistance of the argument of counsel on his behalf."

It was said, in reference to the decision of the Court of Arches, "The learned Judge relies on two former judgments of this Committee as having almost determined the question

¹ BROOKE'S *Six Privy Council Judgments*, p. 42.

of Vestments; one of these is the case of *Westerton v. Liddell*, and the other is the case of *Martin v. Mackonochie*. In *Westerton v. Liddell*," the Report went on to say, "the question which their Lordships had to decide was, whether the Rubric which excluded all crosses used in the Service affected crosses not used in the Service, but employed for decoration of the building only; and they determined that these were unaffected by the Rubric. They decided that the Rubric in question referred to the Act passed in 2 and 3 Edward VI., adopting the first Prayer Book of Edward VI., and not to any Canons or Injunctions having the authority of Parliament, but adopted at an earlier period. Their Lordships feel quite free to adopt both the positive and the negative conclusions thus arrived at. In construing the expressions made use of in that judgment, it should be borne in mind, that *this question of Vestments was not before the Courts*. In *Martin v. Mackonochie* the Committee stated anew the substance of the judgment in *Westerton v. Liddell* upon this point, but did not propose to take up any new ground."

Upon this it must be observed, that undoubtedly it would have been perfectly competent to the Committee to decide that "decorations" were not "ornaments;" and that the Rubric in question, and its interpretation, had nothing to do with the question before the Court. But this was *not* what the Committee did. It addressed itself to the question what were the Ornaments within the scope of the Rubric; and it decided what they were, viz. those which were required, not by other Canons or Injunctions, but explicitly by the first Prayer Book of Edward VI. They examined the history of the Rubric itself, and the changes it underwent, including the last Review, making special reference to *vestments*; and pronounced on the whole question in regard to the Rubric of Elizabeth's Prayer Book, the Statute of Elizabeth, James I.'s Prayer Book, and the *present Prayer Book*, that "they all obviously mean the same thing; that the same dresses, and the same utensils or articles which were used under the first Prayer Book of Edward VI. may still be used." In the *Purchas* judgment the Committee went through the history again, with the help of "the researches referred to in" their "remarks," compensating "for the scantiness of some other materials for a judgment," and determined that

these self "same dresses" might *not* be used. It has been said, indeed, that "in both of these cases it was necessary, for the decision of the question actually at issue, that the Judicial Committee should come to a conclusion as to what these words, 'authority of Parliament,' etc., meant, because in each case it was alleged that the Ornaments rubric applied to the questions then at issue, to crosses and other images in *Westerton v. Liddell*, and to lighted candles on the Communion table in *Martin v. Mackonochie*;" but "it was not necessary," so it has been said, "in either of these cases for the Court to go into the further question, whether the ornaments of the ministers are to be those prescribed in Edward's first Prayer Book for the corresponding service; and" it is conceived accordingly that "they expressed no opinion upon it." It may not, indeed, have been necessary; but, I submit, the Committee did go into the question, and most plainly pronounced a decision upon it.

And certainly for a long time there seemed to be no doubt entertained by "lawyers," any more than by "laymen," what the decision in the *Westerton* case went to. In 1865, for instance, there was published *A Collection of the Judgments of the Judicial Committee in Ecclesiastical Cases*, edited, under the direction of the Lord Bishop of London, by the Hon. George C. Brodrick, a barrister at law, with whom was joined the Bishop's chaplain. Under the *Westerton* case it states that "the following points were *decided by this judgment* :

"1. All the articles used in the performance of the services and rites of the Church are 'ornaments' within the meaning of the Rubric, etc. . . .

"2. The Rubric is confined to those articles, the use of which . . . is prescribed by the first Prayer Book of Edward VI. . . ."

The words of the learned Judge of the Arches Court, in the *Purchas* case, after giving his own opinion on the question, were: "I am bound to say that I think this rubric has already received a construction from an authority which is binding upon me. It has been *twice considered and elaborately reviewed* by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, . . . and in both instances precisely the same construction was put upon it. It certainly would seem at first sight that these judgments have made my course plain. I have, in obedience to them, but to

inquire whether these 'ornaments of the minister' are to be found in the first Prayer Book of Edward VI.; if they are, to pronounce them legal; if not, illegal.

"Two objections," the learned Judge went on to say, "are raised to the application of this *plain and clear language* (of the two Judgments) to the present case. First, it is said that the question of the ornaments of the Minister was not directly before the Court in *Liddell v. Westerton*, but only the ornaments of the Church; and this is literally true; but how little can it avail to prevent the application of the same rule to both kinds of ornament. . . . The common rules of grammar and sense require that I should not divide a sentence and apply a predicate, equally applicable to both subjects contained in it, to one only. I am not at liberty, if I were so inclined, to question the judgment as to the ornaments of the Church; nor would it become me to express any doubt as to the logic on which it is built. I am bound to follow where that judgment leads me; and if so, I must on the like premisses arrive at the like conclusion."

Dr. Brice, in his recent work, *The Law relating to Public Worship* (p. 215), after quoting the decision in the *Purchas* case, says, "It is scarcely reconcilable with the language used by the Privy Council in *Westerton v. Liddell*. Here their Lordships said the rubric to the Prayer Book of James I., 1604, adopts the language of the rubric of Elizabeth; the rubric to the present Prayer Book adopts the language of the statute of Elizabeth; but they all obviously mean the same thing, that the same *dresses* and the same utensils or articles *which were used under the first Prayer Book of Edward VI. may still be used*." There is a marginal note in Dr. Brice, "Decision in *Hebbert v. Purchas* reconcilable with that in *Westerton v. Liddell*." The note is "scarcely reconcilable" with the text; the reconciling word "scarcely," I presume, has by accident dropped out. Dr. Brice subsequently remarks, that the *Purchas* judgment "is at variance with at least some of the dicta put forth in *Westerton v. Liddell*." (Page 218.)

In regard, then, to the decisions of Courts of Law, the case stood thus, in a position closely corresponding with that of the Rubric before the Prayer of Consecration. Only in the present

case there had been *two* decisions, instead of one, of the Judicial Committee; and the Court of Arches had, moreover, given its judgment on independent grounds, beside that of being bound by the decision of the superior Court. The judgment of the Judicial Committee in the Mackonochie case, together with the whole pleadings, and also the judgment of the Arches Court in the Purchas case, were given in the Appendix to the Fourth Report of the Ritual Commission. The Dean of the Arches had regarded this as "the most serious matter" in the Purchas case, and had dealt with it accordingly, primarily and very fully; and this judgment concluded the document put forth by the Ritual Commission. The Fourth Report appeared Aug. 31, 1870. In Feb. 1871 came the decision of the Judicial Committee in the contrary sense.

The action of the Ritual Commissioners, it should be observed, had been as follows. The terms of the original commission given them, it will be borne in mind, were that they should inquire into "the differences of practice" which had "arisen from varying interpretations put upon the Rubrics, etc., . . . and more especially with reference to the Ornaments used in the Churches and Chapels of the United Church, and the Vestments worn by the Ministers thereof at the time of their ministration; with the view of explaining or amending the said Rubrics, Orders, and Directions, so as to secure general uniformity of practice in such matters as may be deemed essential." At the first meeting of the Commissioners (June 17, 1867) it was resolved, "that the first object to be considered be that pointed out in the Commission as most pressing, viz. the Ornaments used in the Churches and Chapels of the United Church, and the Vestments worn by the Ministers thereof." At eight successive meetings witnesses were examined, and at nine more "the Commissioners deliberated;" and at the nineteenth meeting they settled their First Report. At the eleventh meeting it had been resolved, "That the resolutions proposed by Lord Portman be taken as the basis of our deliberations." Of these the first was, "That it is desirable, for the *removal of any doubts*, and for the *clear understanding of the phrases in the Rubrics* and Acts of Parliament which *may be liable to misconstruction*, to declare by an Act of

Parliament that the Vestments of Ministers *shall be understood* to be those which have for a long series of years and now are commonly retained and used in the Cathedrals and parish churches of England." It was, undoubtedly, "a short and easy method with" the Rubrics, and the right and true interpretation thereof. At the next meeting it was resolved, "That it is *expedient* that the vesture of the clergy in saying the public Prayers, and in ministering the Sacraments and other rites of the Church, shall be that which has been for a long series of years and now is commonly retained and used; provided, nevertheless, that nothing contained in this resolution shall be holden to prevent the Commission from considering the expediency of any exceptions to it." Various "exceptions" were proposed at subsequent meetings, discussed, and rejected; and the First Report of the Commission¹ was in accordance with the above resolution. At the sixty-ninth meeting the discussion of the "Ornaments" Rubric was resumed, and continued the next day (April 22, 1869); several suggestions considered, but all rejected. Again, at the ninety-sixth and ninety-eighth meetings, and at the one hundred and seventh—the last meeting but one—and so the Rubric remained just as it stood.

And the general feeling of Churchmen, I believe, was in accordance with the opinion, which the late Bishop of St. David's expressed, in his Charge of 1872. "There is no reason," said his Lordship, "to regret that the Ornaments Rubric, though it had been the chief occasion of the whole agitation which it was the object of the Commission to quiet, was left untouched. The fact itself seems to show that it would have been hardly possible, even if the Commission could have come to an agreement on this point, to bring any action of the Legislature to bear upon it without risk of very inconvenient consequences." Only, in fairness to all parties, it should be borne in mind that, by the course which the Ritual Commissioners took, the result meanwhile arrived at was the publication of the

¹ This bore date August 19, 1867. When the Commission reassembled, in the November following, it was agreed to postpone the question of Ornaments till the Mackonochie case had been heard; and the Commissioners, meanwhile, betook themselves to a general review of the Rubrics in the Book of Common Prayer.

judgment of the Court of Arches, with their authority, adopting it in some sort, as an appendix to their Second Report; and, as an appendix to the Fourth Report, the decision of the Judicial Committee in the Mackonochie case; both alike maintaining the legality of the ornaments of the First Book of Edward VI.

To pass on now from the decisions of the Courts to the opinions of high legal authorities, it should be recalled to mind that, in May 1866, two cases, very carefully prepared, and stating all the particulars of the question, were submitted, one for "the joint opinion thereon of the Attorney-General [Sir Roundell Palmer, now Lord Selborne], Sir Hugh M. Cairns, Q.C. [the present Lord Chancellor], Mr. Mellish, Q.C. [now Lord Justice], and Mr. Barrow;" another, in Dec. 1866, "for the opinions thereon of Her Majesty's Advocate [Sir R. Phillimore, Q.C.], Sir Fitzroy Kelly, Q.C. [afterwards Lord Chief Baron], Sir W. Bovill, Q.C. [afterwards Lord Chief Justice of the Common Pleas], Mr. W. M. James, Q.C. [now Lord Justice], Dr. Deane, Q.C., Mr. J. D. Coleridge, Q.C., M.P. [now Lord Chief Justice of the C.P.], Mr. G. C. Prideaux, Mr. J. Hannen [now Sir James Hannen], and Mr. J. Cutler, Professor of Law, King's College, London." The opinion of the four first named lawyers was *against* the legality of the Vestments; the opinions of the nine last named were *in favour* of it.

With this array of individual legal authorities, as well as decisions of courts, on either side, the question,—it will be evident, I think, to calmly judging minds,—is not one which, we can take for granted, would be settled by the opinion of a barrister of seven years' standing, or even of a "first rate judge," unless the course of legal study in which he has spent his life has lain in the direction of Church law or ecclesiastical practice. That there is not the amount of study of the Civil law or ecclesiastical jurisprudence which there was in past days, is a simple fact which has been the not unforeseen, but at the same time the inevitable, consequence of the transference of matrimonial and testamentary causes from the Civil Law bar to another court created under the provisions of Acts of Parliament passed within the last twenty years. The Civil and Ecclesiastical law courts have been starved out.

"What the Courts of Law may do in future," it has been

lately said, and may fitly be repeated here, "it would be alike uncertain and improper to predict."¹ But the contingencies of litigation—the chances of war—were sketched out by the Lord Chancellor in the House of Lords in the debate on the Public Worship Regulation Act. His Lordship followed up the remarks which have been quoted in the preceding Charge by saying, "If we look at the past history of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, we shall be able to find that certainly there is one case of great importance in which a decision arrived at by the Judicial Committee was afterwards altered by the same tribunal. Suppose it should be hereafter decided by the final tribunal of the country, that the proper position of the minister at the time of consecration is to stand in front of the people looking towards the east. Remember that, if it be so decided, that decision will be compulsory upon every clergyman of the Church of England. Now if that should turn out to be the law of the Church, it is a law which would press heavily upon the conscience of a great many clergymen of the Church of England. But suppose that the tribunal should decide that the proper position for the clergyman is to stand looking towards the south. There are hundreds, if not thousands, of clergymen whose habit it has been all their lives, before ritualism was thought of, certainly before it was developed, to stand in the other position. I ask your lordships to consider how a final declaration of the law to the effect that I have mentioned would bear upon the consciences of these clergymen. But suppose the Court of Ultimate Appeal should say the rubrics are so obscure that we will leave the question of the position of the minister during the time of consecration *in dubio*; after a long, and difficult, and acrimonious legislation you come to the very conclusion at which the proposal of the right reverend prelate asks you to arrive. The right reverend prelate proposes that no proceeding respecting the matters which he enumerates should be commenced under this bill, leaving it thus open to any to take proceedings under the existing law; but I suggest that no proceedings should be taken at all for the enforcement of civil penalties."

It is not necessary here to discuss the proposal with immediate reference to which the observations of the Lord Chancellor

¹ *Quarterly Review* for July, page 282.

were made. "It is now understood that this amendment was not conceived by the Bishop of Peterborough;"¹ but by whomsoever it was conceived, no one, I believe, regrets that it came to nought, as a legislative "dispensation," to be obtained by Parliamentary discussion or debate, in regard to certain parts, the most sacred, of the Book of Common Prayer. "When the amendment was stripped of its superfluities," says a Reviewer,² "it appeared to offer to the 'Low Church party' the power to disuse the Communion Service in return for the power to the 'High Church' clergyman to stand on the North side [*qu.* on the West side]. But this proposal was viewed with swift-growing disfavour by almost all parties. It was seen that the original list of exceptions was delusive; that far more things would be added, or at least striven for; and no party was disposed to barter important principles for leave to carry out its own principles more fully."—It might rather be said (for in fact this was found to be the result) that they declared themselves not prepared to put Creeds and solemn Services into the balance against a vestment or a position, however important it might appear.—"If the list of exceptions became very large, the principle of uniformity would be abandoned, and the list itself reduced to an absurdity." But, on the other hand, the observations of the Lord Chancellor remain in full force, in their general principle, with regard to the recognition of "a certain area of arguable ground" in the case of the rubrics in question; the diversity of legal opinion, and decisions of courts, proving abundantly that it *is* fairly "arguable ground;" and supplying, as I venture to think, ample reason for leaving these matters to be dealt with (as the courts have before now in such cases laid down) by the authority of the Bishop, in the exercise of the discretion vested in him by the Prayer Book, and now, we may say, ratified and sustained by the recent Act. If the questions immediately before us are carried again to the Judicial Committee,—its jurisdiction at present remaining, in the suspension of the provisions of the Supreme Judicature Act of 1873,—the case will stand thus. In regard to the "position of the celebrant," there have been hitherto, as we have seen, two decisions in an opposite sense; a fresh decision, if the

¹ *Quarterly Review* for October 1874, p. 570.

² *Ibid.*

Committee decided the question either way, would give to the one side or the other a majority of 2 : 1. In regard to the vestments, if it decided one way, it would give a majority of decisions in favour, 3 : 1; if the other way, they would be equally balanced; and great interest would obviously attach to some future decision, which would be, in common parlance, the "winning game." But whether all this would be for the interests of the Church, or for the peace of the community, is another and a graver question. It is, of course, naturally enough, a popular notion, that a Bishop would derive strength—the whole strength of his office, as some would suppose—from his having a legal judgment which he is simply to enforce. I venture to express my conviction that it would be found far otherwise; that many a clergyman who finds it difficult to acquiesce in conflicting decisions of Judicial Committees would, in obedience to his Ordination vow, not unwillingly submit himself to the "godly judgment" of his Diocesan, "taking order," in conformity with the rule of the Prayer Book, for "the quieting and appeasing" of doubt and diversity of opinion in his parish. Anyhow, it is the rule of the Church, and entitled to a fair trial, as the duly appointed remedy for our maladies. One inevitable effect of a series of prosecutions,—and, in consequence, defences,—by organised parties has been to prevent altogether, or seriously to interfere with, the freedom of personal communication, in emergent cases, between Bishops and Clergy; godly admonitions and godly judgments freely given and received.

It is a rule, moreover, which would harmonise, in practice, opinions in regard to the true interpretation of the rubrics, which appear otherwise hopelessly at variance. It has been stated above with what view, as it is conceived, the Rubric before the Prayer of Consecration was left designedly in some degree open; though practically in regard to the usage in the several Dioceses uniformity was intended. So also in the case of vestments. What Bishop Cosin, and those with whom he was acting, chiefly desired to establish was the use of the surplice as against Genevan disorder; but he would wish, at the same time, that the ancient vestments should be "retained" and recognised as part of the full ritual of the Church of England in relation

pecially to other Churches. He would have thought it, no doubt, an advantage, that in any "*Origines Liturgicæ*" the Church of England should be able to claim these as her traditional possessions, as well as to be able to appeal to Ancient Liturgies as the source of her Forms of Prayer and other rites and ceremonies.¹ Queen Elizabeth's Advertisements had been unquestionably an enforcement of order, not against Romanism primarily, but against Puritan non-conformity; and in this sense, enforced a *minimum*; not thereby leaving it to every clergyman in his parish, at his own discretion, to introduce the *maximum*; but reserving to the Church, under lawful authorities, the power of assuming the full ceremonial. The practical superseding of the vestments by the enforcement of the Advertisements no doubt led to the destruction of vestments, and the appropriation of them to secular uses; but the direct object in view was to enforce conformity upon the Puritans. If at a Coronation, not only the Archbishop and the Dean of Westminster, administering the Holy Communion, but the Bishops who said the Litany, and the Prebendaries of the Abbey, wore copes, it might be equally suitable, on such an occasion, for instance, as when a dignitary of the English Church was called to officiate, amidst dignitaries, say, of the Greek Church, as at a recent Royal marriage at St. Petersburg. To take an illustration from the Court of the Sovereign, and the usages of Parliament—the recognised full "dress" of the Court is that of the reign of Queen Anne, and it is worn at levées and drawing rooms of the Sovereign; at levées of the Speaker, and in the moving and seconding of the Address in either House of Parliament; the ordinary "full dress" being that which is used at dinner parties, or the like, at the Royal Palace. If, instead of this, any persons took upon them to come in ordinary morning attire, something like Royal Advertisements might be required to enforce the ordinary full dress; not setting aside, meanwhile, the recognised costume of formal Court etiquette; while, on the other hand, it would be unfitting, and an offence against the laws of the Court, to assume on ordinary occasions, without permission or authority, the special dress of official ceremonial. The

¹ See the Appendix to PALMER'S *Origines*, vol. ii.

present aspect of the question, in a legal point of view, is, I conceive, precisely that which would result from the course which was advisedly taken by Queen Elizabeth; amidst difficulties which we can the better understand from those by which we ourselves are beset.

I had occasion in the preceding Charge (p. 29), to give the Resolutions unanimously adopted by the Lower House of Convocation of the Province of Canterbury, in regard to "the position of the celebrant," at the group of sessions which had just been held at the time of the Visitation. The question of Vestments was dealt with in subsequent of sessions held in June and July. The course of debate in the two cases was very similar; and the Resolution finally adopted on the subject of Vestments was as follows, carried by a very large majority.

"That in consideration of the long disuse of certain of the Vestments specified in the First Prayer Book of King Edward VI., and referred to in the Ornaments Rubric, this House recommends :

"First. That in celebrating the Holy Communion, as well as at all other times of his ministration, it shall suffice that the Minister do wear a surplice, with the addition of a stole or scarf, and of the hood of his degree; and that in preaching the Minister do wear the surplice, with stole or scarf, and the hood of his degree; or, if he think fit, a gown and hood.

"Second. That the vestures specified in the First Prayer Book of King Edward VI. shall not be brought into use in any church, other than a cathedral or collegiate church, without the previous consent of the Bishop."

"And it is hereby declared that by this resolution no sanction is intended to be given to any doctrine other than is set forth in the Prayer Book or Articles of the Church of England."

This last declaration was carried unanimously.

A preamble was afterwards prefixed, recommending that, "in the event of action being taken by legislation or otherwise," such action should be based upon these resolutions, with a certain note to be appended, in such case, to the Ornaments Rubric. The Upper House resolved, that "legislation on these points" was "at the present time neither desirable nor prac-

licable," and therefore did not "deem it expedient now to discuss the course which any such legislation should take, or the principles according to which it should be regulated." Meanwhile the object with which the Letters of Business had been granted had been sufficiently answered; and the general feeling of the Church, both Clergy and Laity, had been tolerably well ascertained.

The resolutions of April 16 and July 2, I conceive, very faithfully reflect the spirit and letter of the Rubrics, taken in connexion, in the latter case particularly, with the Advertisements of Queen Elizabeth and the canons of 1603; both resolutions alike falling back on the rule embodied in the Preface to the Prayer Book. In the one case it was "provided that, in cases where changes were made and disputes arise, it be left to the Ordinary to determine which practice shall be adopted;" in the other, that the vestures in question "shall not be brought into use in any church, other than a cathedral or collegiate church, without the previous consent of the Bishop." It seems to have been thought in some quarters, that there was an omission, on the part of the Lower House, in regard to past offences, as if they were ignored or condoned. It appeared to me, I must say, as I believe it did to others also, that the Lower House would be departing from its proper function if it dealt with the administration of the Church's law; that that indeed belonged to the Bishops; Convocation was neither the Church's executive nor one of her courts of law; but simply her synod, a deliberative body, taking counsel as to what should be the rule to be observed for the future, in order to the Church's peace and well-being.

In concluding these notes, I may be allowed to offer as my apology for the delay which has occurred in the publication of the Charge, the desire which I have felt to answer more fully the object in view in the wish which was expressed for its publication. The accessions which were making every week, and at one time almost every day, to "the mass of controversial literature" on the subject, made it necessary to enter more into detail than I had at first contemplated; and a variety of pressing

duties, of different kinds, especially prolonged sessions of Convocation on this and kindred matters, hindered my work. I will now only add, that I trust what I have put together may, in its humble degree, be found to subserve the interests of unity and charity; in the desire to "execute the judgment of truth and peace in" our "gates," and fulfil the command Divinely given to us all to "love the truth and peace."¹ I will only say for myself that I have endeavoured, in my appointed place and office in the Church, and in cordial co-operation with my brethren of the Lower House of Convocation, and in dutiful regard to his Grace the President, our Most Reverend Diocesan, and his Brethren in the Upper House, to have in mind the principles and rules of action laid down in the Preface to the Book of Common Prayer, as those which had been kept in view and observed in the proceedings at the last Review. "Our general aim," it was there admirably and truly said, "in this undertaking was not to gratify this or that party in any their unreasonable demands: but to do that which, to our best understandings we conceived might most tend to the preservation of peace and unity in the Church; the procuring of reverence, and exciting of piety and devotion in the public worship of God, or the cutting off occasion from them that seek occasion of cavil or quarrel against the Liturgy of our Church." "And having thus endeavoured to discharge our duties in this weighty affair, as in the sight of God and to approve our sincerity therein (so far as lay in us) to the consciences of all men; although we know it impossible (in such variety of apprehensions, humours, and interests as are in the world) to please all; nor can expect that men of factious, peevish, and perverse spirits should be satisfied with anything that can be done in this kind by any other than themselves; Yet we have been in good hope that what is here presented, and hath been by the Convocations of both Provinces with great diligence examined and approved, will be also well accepted and approved by all sober, peaceable, and truly conscientious sons of the Church of England."

¹ Zech. viii. 16, 19.

"O PRAY FOR THE PEACE OF JERUSALEM: THEY SHALL PROSPER THAT LOVE THEE.

"PEACE BE WITHIN THY WALLS: AND PLENTIOUSNESS WITHIN THY PALACES.

"FOR MY BRETHREN AND COMPANIONS' SAKES, I WILL NOW SAY, PEACE BE WITHIN THEE.

"YEA, BECAUSE OF THE HOUSE OF THE LORD OUR GOD I WILL SEEK THY GOOD."

Psalm cxxii. 6-9.

PRECINCTS, CANTERBURY,
Oct. 12, 1875.

ERRATA.

Page 8, line 9, *for* Berstead *read* Bearsted.

Page 53, line 12 from bottom, *omit a after* such.

Page 62, line 18, *for* what *read* which.

Page 67, line 23 from bottom, *after* Chance! *insert comma.*

Page 70, line 9 from bottom, *for* Presbyter *read* Pystoler.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

Recently Published.

Visitation Courts and Synods. A Charge delivered
to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Maidstone, at the Ordinary
Visitation in May 1871. Price 1s.

The Unity of a Christian Kingdom in the One
Church of God. A Sermon preached in Canterbury Cathedral,
February 27, 1872, being the Day of National Thanksgiving to
Almighty God for the Recovery of H.R.H. Albert Edward, Prince of
Wales. Price 1s.

Ritual Uniformity and Elasticity, and Church
Desecration. A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry
of Maidstone, at the Ordinary Visitation in May 1873.

Measures and Means of Unity in the Church at
the Present Time. A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Arch-
deaconry of Maidstone at the Ordinary Visitation in April 1874.

RIVINGTONS

London, Oxford, and Cambridge

